

AUMLA

*Journal of the Australasian Universities
Language and Literature Association*

NUMBER FIFTEEN

MAY 1961

AUMLA

JOURNAL OF THE AUSTRALASIAN UNIVERSITIES
LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE ASSOCIATION

(AFFILIATED WITH THE F.I.L.L.M.)

*Formerly the Australasian Universities Modern
Languages Association*

A JOURNAL OF LITERARY CRITICISM, PHILOLOGY & LINGUISTICS

CONTENTS

MURRAY TODD	page 3
THE FAME OF ARATUS, <i>D. A. Kidd</i>	5
VALERY'S <i>EBAUCHE D'UN SERPENT</i> , <i>A. R. Chisholm</i>	19
CURTIUS RUFUS AND THE <i>HISTORIAE ALEXANDRI</i> , <i>G. V. Sumner</i>	30
HESIOD AND THE ODYSSEY, <i>L. G. Pocock</i>	40
MASSINGER'S USE OF HIS SOURCES FROM <i>THE ROMAN ACTOR</i> , <i>C. A. Gibson</i>	60
THE TREATMENT OF CLASSICAL MATERIAL IN SOME PLAYS OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY, <i>F. H. Mares</i>	73
BOOK REVIEWS	80
BOOKS RECEIVED	120
NOTES	122

Number Fifteen May 1961

Editor: R. T. SUSSEX

Associate Editor: I. H. SMITH

Editorial Board: K. F. QUINN, J. SMIT,
JOAN STEVENS

Business Manager: T. E. CARTER

Manuscripts, editorial communications and books for review should be addressed to the *Editor, Aumla*, at the address given below. Every effort will be made to return rejected copy if an addressed envelope is enclosed, though the Editor can accept no responsibility for return of manuscripts. In accepting articles for publication the Editorial Board will normally give preference to those submitted by members of the Association.

Editorial Address:

DEPARTMENT OF MODERN LANGUAGES
UNIVERSITY OF CANTERBURY
P.O. Box 1471, CHRISTCHURCH
NEW ZEALAND

Price per Copy to Non-Members:
10s. (Australian); 8s. (New Zealand)

PRINTED AT THE CAXTON PRESS, CHRISTCHURCH

IN MEMORIAM MURRAY TODD

It is with deep regret that we record the death on 30 December 1960 of Francis Murray Todd, Professor of English in the University of Tasmania, and member of the editorial board of this journal. He was thirty-six years of age.

After completing his M.A. at Victoria College, Wellington, in 1944, he was awarded the Shirlcliffe Research Fellowship by the University of New Zealand and in 1948 took the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of London for a thesis on Wordsworth. In 1949 he was appointed to the Department of English at Canberra University College. In 1955 he was promoted to Senior Lecturer and that same year spent some time in Cambridge and later travelled in America on a Carnegie grant. In August 1956 he took up the chair of English at the University of Tasmania and in the following year his study of Wordsworth, *Politics and the Poet*, appeared in London. Gifted with tremendous energy and drive, he was in the very prime of his career when he was struck down with leukaemia.

His loss is doubly bitter. Bitter, first because of what he was: a man of high moral integrity and moral courage, with a razor-sharp mind and a superb command of words, a brilliant and much loved teacher, a severe scholar and the best of companions with a delightful sense of fun. But his loss is bitter, too, because of all that he promised to be, because of all that the future seemed to hold for him: the education of his three small daughters, the full flowering of the excellent department he had taken over and had developed, the maturing of the students who had sat under him, the continuation of his work on the Romantic poets and so much else besides.

For one who knew him during his Tasmanian days it is strange that in this new academic year he cannot share our delight—at being at last on the new site of the university, at seeing the magnificence of the new library; strange, too, that we do not see his tall, spare figure walking along the dusty roads, picking a path through the builders' rubble and the knots of students still fresh from vacation. Strange, and infinitely sad. But so it is . . . 'Home art gone and ta'en thy wages'.

AUMLA

*Journal of the Australasian Universities
Language & Literature Association*

NO. 15 MAY 1961

THE FAME OF ARATUS

D. A. KIDD

University of Canterbury

OVID in *Amores* i, 15, 9-18 gives a representative list of Greek poets whose fame will live for ever: Homer, of course, and Hesiod, Callimachus for the Alexandrians, Sophocles to represent tragedy, and Menander comedy; and among this distinguished company we find the now almost forgotten Aratus, cited moreover with the most extravagant prophecy of all (16):

cum sole et luna semper Aratus erit.

Ovid, is however, not to be taken literally: it is merely his way of associating the idea of fame with the subject-matter of the poet's work, the astronomical poem, *Phaenomena*.¹

Aratus was a colonial Greek, born at Soli in Cilicia some time about the year 315 B.C. He was a scholarly man, with a wide range of interests, literature first and foremost, then philosophy and science. As a student at Ephesus under Menecrates, the author of an agricultural poem called (after Hesiod) *Erga*, he may have been introduced to the new possibilities of didactic verse, but how far Menecrates derived his subject-matter from literary or technical sources we do not know. At all events Aratus was a student in Athens when that city was still the intellectual centre of the world and lively with new ideas in both literature and philosophy. Literature he studied under Praxiphanes at the Lyceum, where astronomy was no doubt also one of his subjects, and he was then attracted to the new philosophical teaching of Zeno in the Stoa. It was in Zeno's company that he met Antigonus Gonatas, who invited the poet to his court when he became king of Macedonia in 276 and set up an intellectual circle there under his patronage. Tradition² has it that it was Antigonus who gave Aratus the assignment of versifying the

Phaenomena of Eudoxus, but this is a typical biographer's anecdote, and we need not take it seriously, any more than we do the suggestion that the *Georgics* were Maecenas's idea. It is more likely that Aratus conceived his poem in the stimulating environment of Athens, but we may believe that Antigonus encouraged the work and invited the poet to Pella so that he could be free to complete his project.

The *Phaenomena* is in fact much more than a paraphrase of Eudoxus. It is a poem of 1154 lines, and the Eudoxan material provides for only one, albeit the longest, of its three sections. It opens with a proem of 18 lines in the manner of a Stoic hymn to Zeus. The central and longest section (19-732) contains the astronomical material derived from Eudoxus: the northern and southern constellations, with a description of the appearance and relative position of each; the celestial circles, viz. the Milky Way, the two Tropics, the Equator and the Zodiac; and the constellations that rise and set simultaneously with the rising of each Zodiacal sign. The final section is linked to the preceding one by a passage on the calendar, and then sets out a list of weather signs, often referred to by a separate title, *Diosemeia*, and derived from a prose treatise known as *De Signis* and traditionally attributed to Theophrastus.

The poem enjoyed an immediate and lasting success. Antigonus, we are told, greeted its author with the obvious but satisfying pun: *εὐδοξότερον ποιεῖς τὸν Εὐδόξον*.³ Leonidas of Tarentum hailed him as second to Zeus because he made the stars *φαινότερα*.⁴ More soberly Callimachus lists his literary merits in *Epigram* 27. Many imitators soon followed his lead, but Ptolemy (?Euergetes) declared that Aratus still held the sceptre among them.⁵ In the 2nd century B.C. there appeared commentaries on the *Phaenomena*, one by Attalus explaining the astronomical matter, and a more famous one by the astronomer Hipparchus pointing out the factual errors in both Eudoxus and Aratus. Indeed nothing illustrates the fame of Aratus more than the fact that of all the writings of the greatest astronomer of antiquity this relatively unimportant commentary is the only one that survives complete today. There were also philosophical commentaries by the Stoics Boethus of Sidon and Diodorus of Alexandria. Thereafter throughout antiquity and into the medieval period the series of epexegetical commentaries continued.

In the first century B.C. Aratus became known to Roman writers. Helvius Cinna brought home from Bithynia a rather special copy of the *Phaenomena* written on mallow bark, and sent it to a friend with a covering quatrain:

haec tibi Arateis multum inuigilata lucernis
carmina, quis ignis nouimus aetherios,

The Fame of Aratus

leuis in aridulo maluae descripta libello

Prusiaca uexi munera nauicula.⁶

Cicero in his student days translated the poem into Latin hexameters, and thought well enough of his version to quote long excerpts from it in his *De Natura Deorum* (ii, 104-114). Another and more polished version by Varro of Atax has left only a handful of lines to posterity because Virgil incorporated one of them in his *Georgics* (i, 377)

aut arguta lacus circumuolitauit hirundo,

and the fourth century commentary of Servius ad loc. has quoted the passage from Varro. Translations are also extant by Germanicus of the first century A.D. and by Avienus in the fourth. In fact no other Classical text has so much evidence of this kind from so early a date. The admiration of the Greeks is reflected in the Latin writers. Cicero voices the general agreement that although Aratus was no astronomer, his verse was excellent: 'constat inter doctos hominem ignarum astrologiae ornatissimis atque optimis uersibus Aratum de caelo stellisque dixisse' (*De Oratore* i, 16, 69). Cf. also *Rep.* 1, 14, 22. Virgil never refers to him directly, but almost the whole of the material for the weather signs in *Georgics* i, 351-460 is drawn from the *Phaenomena*. It may be conjectured too that the prevalence of astronomical lore in the poetry of the Romans is in part due to their familiarity with this poem.

The fame of Aratus in antiquity contrasts so strikingly with his obscurity today that it is pertinent to ask what factors were responsible for his success and what is the reason for the present *peripeteia* of his fortunes. There were several reasons for the success of the poem. In the first place the subject, astronomy, was a popular one with the literate public. There was the practical problem of determining the exact length of the year and then devising a calendar that would reconcile the solar and the lunar periods. The most successful solution of this was Meton's nineteen year cycle, and Aratus refers to this in 752-7. Another practical requirement was an accurate map of the sky, and this was one of the original contributions made to science by Eudoxus, a brilliant pupil of Plato's who lived about a century before Aratus. In addition to his descriptive account of the sky Eudoxus is said to have been the first to introduce a celestial globe into Greece⁷, and there is evidence that Aratus used a star-globe⁸ as well as Eudoxus's text-book. A theoretical problem of the time was how to explain the erratic movements of the planets against the background of the fixed stars. Eudoxus had also worked on this problem, but Aratus passes over the subject with a brief mention of it, followed by the candid admission that

the theory of planetary motions is beyond him (454-461). It was perhaps this remark of his that led later writers, including Cicero, to describe him as ignorant of astronomy, but in fact he is rather to be thought of as the intelligent layman, who understands and is fascinated by the descriptive side of astronomy, but does not pretend to go far with the mathematics of it. The *Vita* attributed to Theon of Alexandria in the fourth century A.D. certainly credits Aratus with having taken pains to understand Eudoxus,⁹ as Callimachus implies when he refers to his σύντονος ἀγρυπνίη, just as Leonidas does when he gives Aratus the epithet δαήμων. Throughout the Roman empire, when astrology was rampant, the *Phaenomena* was a popular handbook to the stars, and we find the ignorant Trimalchio in Petronius coupling the poet with Hipparchus as a great astronomer (*Cena* 40).

A second reason for Aratus's popularity was the Stoic slant with which the subject was treated. The poem has a kind of religious basis, looking to Zeus as the director of the universe and all that it contains. The first three words ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα, 'let us begin with Zeus', echo an old religious formula, and became almost as celebrated as the opening words of the *Odyssey*. They are followed by a glorification of Zeus,

whom we men never allow to go unnamed :
filled with his presence are all the highways and all
the meeting-places of men, the sea, and its harbours;
and everywhere we all feel the need of Zeus :
for we are also his children,

τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος εἰμέν, the words which that other Cilician, St. Paul, quoted to the Athenians some three centuries later, knowing that the quotation would be recognized.¹⁰ Zeus is a beneficent, fatherly god, who gives men signs in the sky by which they can determine the seasons and forecast the weather, and so ensure that their harvests will be fruitful (10-13):

αὐτὸς γὰρ τὰ γε σήματ' ἐν οὐρανῷ ἐστήριξεν
ἄστρον διακρίνας, ἐσκέψατο δ' εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν
ἄστερας οἳ κε μάλιστα τετυγμένα σημαίνουσιν
ἀνδράσιν ὥρῳ, ὅφρ' ἔμπεδα πάντα φύωνται.

Throughout the poem the name of Zeus keeps recurring, sometimes as a personification of the weather (Διὸς εὐδιόωντος, 899), sometimes as the sky (ἐν Διὶ πατρί, 253), occasionally playing a part in the mythology of the constellations (e.g. in the description of Auriga the star Capella is the goat that suckled the infant Zeus, 163), and otherwise as the power who sends the signs of seasons

and weather: he is responsible for the rising and the setting of the Pleiads which mark the beginnings of summer and winter (265-6), he shows us the times to plough and sow (742-3), he sends the rains and the cold weather (936, 964, 293), but he still keeps many secrets to himself (769-70). This is a much more comforting picture of Zeus than the stern Hesiodic god who wilfully brought us only hardship and toil, and the anonymous biographer is no doubt right in claiming that Aratus was superior to all other authors of *Phaenomena* because he based his poem on the philosophical doctrine that there is a benevolent power directing the whole universe.¹¹

Thirdly, the *Phaenomena* was also a literary success, and this is the aspect in which I am particularly interested, partly because it is the one which is commonly overlooked. Modern historians of Greek literature tend to dismiss the poem as of little or no poetic merit and owing its success entirely to its Stoicism. E. A. Barber in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* calls the style 'sober' and sees poetic colour only in the digressions. Gilbert Murray¹² thinks the popularity of the poem was due to the emotional appeal of the starry heavens. Bowra's *Ancient Greek Literature*¹³ does not even mention the poet. L. A. S. Jermyn, in an otherwise useful article on 'Weather-signs in Virgil'¹⁴ writes: 'The *Phaenomena* of Aratus is a dull, pretentious piece of versification, of interest to us only because it contains a number of seasonal signs which Virgil has scattered about the *Georgics*.' This comment on Virgil's technique is incidentally quite misleading, and the literary criticism of Aratus in the first part of the sentence is even more inaccurate. But it is a common judgment on Aratus, and it is a part of the purpose of the present article to refute it.

In the opinion of Aratus's contemporaries his poem was undoubtedly a literary success. Callimachus's epigram (27) alone is enough to make this clear. It is no vague eulogy, but a carefully considered criticism, delivered point by point:

Ἡσιόδου τό τ' αἶσμα καὶ ὁ τρόπος· οὐ τὸν αἰοιδῶν
ἔσχατον, ἀλλ' ὀκνέω μὴ τὸ μελιχρότατον
τῶν ἐπέων ὃ Σολεὺς ἀπεμάξατο· χαίρετε λεπταὶ
ῥήσιες, Ἀρήτου σύντονος ἀγρυπνίη.

1. 'Hesiod's theme and style are here: it was not the greatest of the poets, but perhaps the most attractive of the epic bards that the man from Soli took as his model.' This view of Hesiod takes one by surprise, since we do not normally describe his poetry as 'honeyed', but it clearly represents the Alexandrian reaction against the affectations of fourth century epic, e.g. that of Panyasis and Antimachus, with its labouring of the old myths and its overblown.

pseudo-poetic language. Hesiod's refreshing down-to-earthness made him seem by comparison more attractive even than Homer, 'the greatest of the poets'. 2. 'A welcome to such straightforward language.' The characteristic virtue of Aratus's verse is that it is λεπτός, and this is, of course, a typically Alexandrian virtue: cf. Callimachus *Πρὸς Τελχίνας* 24, where Apollo is said to demand of the poet a fat offering but a slim poem, *μοῦσαν . . . λεπταλέην*. The word denotes the plain, straightforward style of writing, clear and direct, without any inflated language or superfluous matter. We find the same word applied to Aratus by Leonidas of Tarentum⁴,

γράμμα τόδ' Ἀρήτου δαήμονος, ὅς ποτε λεπτῇ
φροντίδι δηναίους ἀστέρας ἐφράσατο,

and Ptolemy calls him λεπτολόγος.⁵ Coming from these Alexandrians, the term is certainly a complimentary one, and its repetition suggests that Aratus was regarded by many as a model of the plain style in verse. 3. 'The hard work and sleepless nights of Aratus.' The word which literally means 'sleepless nights' denotes the meticulous craftsmanship, the polishing and revising that go to the perfection of a work of art. This is another feature of Alexandrianism, and we are familiar with it also as an ideal of the Augustan poets, whose spokesman Horace expresses it in the words *ars, studium, litura, and limae labor*.¹⁵

Callimachus, then, compliments Aratus for his Hesiodic inspiration, his mastery of the plain style, and his thorough craftsmanship. Leonidas, in the couplet quoted above, has given him another epithet stamped with the seal of Alexandrian approval, *δαήμων*, scholarly, like the *doctus poeta* of Catullus's circle. This word acknowledges his interest in scientific lore as well as his technical ability as a craftsman. Even the critical Hipparchus, who discovers so many factual errors in the *Phaenomena*, admits the attractiveness of the verse: 'He is a direct and concise poet, and lucid too, even if you can only follow him to a limited extent.' And again, 'The attractiveness of the poetry makes what he says authoritative, and nearly all the commentators on this poet are in agreement with his statements.'¹⁶ It will not do, then, to dismiss the poet airily as a dull fellow. We should assume rather that his contemporaries and immediate successors meant what they said, and study the poem closely to find the secret of those literary qualities that provoked their admiration.

The plain unvarnished directness of the *Phaenomena* is not hard to illustrate. It is a recognized element in the didactic manner, and should be held to denote the deliberate choice of the poet, not a

lack of invention. It is itself a part of his artistry. Aratus can indeed be quite severely prosaic, as in the five lines (545-9) listing the signs of the Zodiac. These are written as if to be a mnemonic, like the corresponding English jingle which begins 'The Ram, the Bull, the Heavenly Twins . . .'

τῷ ἔνι Καρκίνος ἐστί, Λέων ἐπὶ τῷ, καὶ ὑπ' αὐτὸν
Παρθένος, αἱ δ' ἐπὶ οἱ Χηλαὶ καὶ Σκορπίος αὐτός,
Τοξευτῆς τε καὶ Αἰγοκέρως, ἐπὶ δ' Αἰγοκερῇ
Ἵδροχόος, δύο δ' αὐτὸν ὑπ' Ἰχθύες ἀστερόεντες,
τοὺς δὲ μέτα Κριός, Ταῦρος δ' ἐπὶ τῷ Δίδυμοί τε.

'On it (the circle of the Zodiac) lies Cancer, next Leo, and after it Virgo, then Scorpio's Claws and Scorpio itself, Sagittarius and Capricorn, and after Capricorn Aquarius, next to him the starry pair Pisces, and after them Aries, then Taurus and Gemini.' The clarity and conciseness are cleverly managed, and may illustrate the rhetorical teaching of the fourth century on the value of verse for memorising information: ἐν μέτρῳ λέγειν μνήμης χάριν, as Plato has it in the *Phaedrus* (267a5).

But such unrelieved baldness is in fact rare in Aratus, and this suggests that where it does occur it is done consciously. It is more usually varied in a great number of ways. There is the colourful epithet, unexpected but yet apt, which shows Aratus to be a master of what Cicero calls *elegantia*.¹⁷ The Dog-star, for example, is *ποικίλος* (328), the perfect word for its medley of colours; the Milky Way is *πόλιος* (511), which gives a good description of its hazy whiteness; the seasons are *ἐπικάρπιοι* (552), because the whole of the farmer's year is aimed at the harvest. Cf. the epithets *μυρίος* of Draco (47), *αἰόλος* of Cygnus (275), *χαροποὶ καὶ ἀναλδέες* of the nameless stars (394), *εὐποιοητός* of Sagitta (598), and *σφαλερώτερος* of the sky (1151). There is also the unusual verb, similarly chosen for its aptness and vividness. The beating of the storm-winds is expressed by *ἐπιρρήσσουσι* (292); the apparent pressure of clouds on the constellation Ara is described by the verb that literally can be applied to a porter carrying a heavy load, *θλίβεται* (417); the Zodiac is gripped firmly between the two Tropics. *ἐσφῆκωται* (526), a word which literally means 'is wasp-waisted'; the belt of Cepheus just 'scrapes' the horizon, *ἐπιξύει* (650); and the beaches are shouting, *βοόωντες* (910), with the roaring of the sea.

Many of these examples come within the category of metaphor, of which Aratus has a wide range at his disposal, but often unobtrusive rather than bold, and serving to vary the expression of what has to be said over and over again. The Bears are 'wary' of touching the ocean, *πεφυλαγμέναι ὠκεανοῖο* (48); the rainbow

'girdles' the sky, ἔζωσε (940); the stars' light 'is blunted', ἀμβλύνηται (1013); the constellation Pisces lies 'at the approaches to the South', ἐν προμολῇσι νότοιο (239); the sea horizon to the north and the south of a rising sign of the Zodiac forms the 'horns' of ocean, κεράων ἐκάτερθε (566), a meaning that the translators of Aratus have not all understood.¹⁸ A more imaginative metaphor lies in the description of the waxing crescent moon, which successive evenings 'inscribe' with a different brilliance: ἄλλοτε γάρ τ' ἄλλη μιν ἐπιγράφει ἔσπερος αἴγλη (779). And there is the farmer who is presented as taking every possible care 'not to let the summer slip from his grasp', μή οἱ θέρος ἐκ χερὸς ἔρρη (1046). We may note also a metonymy in the use of βῶλος, literally a clod of earth, for the soil (7); and another in the use of the word for 'night' in the sense of 'the night sky', in νύκτα περισκεψέσθαι (199).

The similes in the *Phaenomena* are usually of the simplest kind, especially those which are there merely to indicate what a constellation is supposed to look like. The winding Draco is like a section of a river, οὔη ποταμοῖο ἀπορρώξ (45); Cygnus is like a bird that flies in fair weather, εὐδιόωντι ποτὴν ὄρνιθι εἰκώς (278); the two Fishes are connected by a line of stars like a chain, ἥύτε δεσμά (242); Cassiopeia 'goes down head first like a diver', ἐς κεφαλὴν ἴση δύετ' ἀρνευτῆρι (656). Other similes are more imaginative and fuller in expression as that of the seamen sitting watching the waves 'like diving gulls', ἱκελοι δὲ κολυμβίσιν αἰθνήσιν (296). Occasionally a simile is in the form of a clause and extends to a complete line, as that of the clouds when they have a fleecy appearance, οἶα μάλιστα πόκοισιν εἰκότα ἰνδάλλονται (939), or the vivid comparison of the cheeping of chickens to the sound of dripping water: οἶόν τε σταλάον ψοφείη, ἐπὶ ὕδατι ὕδωρ (962). There is also one Homeric simile, the material of which is borrowed from both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, in which the shape of the constellation Cassiopeia is very aptly likened to a key, and then the poet goes on to elaborate the use of the key moving the bolts of a double door:

οὔη δὲ κληῖδι θύρην ἔντοσθ' ἀραρυῖαν
δικλίδ' ἐπιπλήσσοντες ἀνακρούουσιν ὀχῆας (192-3).

There are also other imaginative touches which enliven the monotony of the subject-matter, the somewhat precious appeal to Artemis for pardon, for example, as a prelude to the story of how Orion made unwelcome advances to her (637). The connection between the stars and mythology was, of course, very close, and affords a natural link between poetry and science. But Aratus is restrained in his use of mythological material, preferring to con-

The Fame of Aratus

fine himself in most cases to descriptive notes on the constellations. Sometimes however we find a passing allusion to mythology, for example the epithet 'Ερμαίη (674) attached to the constellation Lyra, or the use of the name of Poseidon for the sea, and of Zeus for the sky (756). A fuller mythological note is appended to the description of the Bears, recalling how they were translated to the sky by Zeus because they had reared him in his infancy in the Cretan cave (31-5). The long digression on Virgo (98-136) is unique in the poem: it identifies the constellation with the goddess of Justice, and tells the story of her sojourn on earth during the Golden Age, then her gradual withdrawal as the human race became more and more degenerate. It is a purple passage, and its influence may be seen in Catullus 64, 397-406, Virgil's *Fourth Eclogue* and Horace *Odes* iii, 6, 46-8.

Another kind of departure from the plain descriptive style is the frequent use of the second person in calling the reader's attention to what may be observed. The didactic poet is here seen in the traditional role of teacher, and the effect is to move the subject out of the study into the open air. The most striking instance of this is the sudden exclamation which opens the *Diosemeia* (733), οὐχ ὁράας; 'don't you see?', which Lucretius turned into *nonne uides?* (e.g. ii, 196), to catch the fancy of both Virgil (*Georgics* i, 56) and Horace (*Odes* i, 14, 3). The imperative ἐπίτρεπε, 'pay attention', occurs once (890), and a warning is given in the form of a prohibition, μή μοι . . . εὖχεο (413-4), 'do not wish. . . .' But the commonest use of the second person is in verbs of observing, either in the future, as πεύσεαι (405), or in the optative with ἄν or κεν, as κε θήῃσαι (451), κε νοήσαις (495), οὐκ ἄν . . . ἐπιτεκμήραιο (456).

The plain style of Aratus, then, admits a wide range of figurative and allusive language, provided this is not super-added as an ornament, but chosen to play an integral part in the conveying of his information. This produces the kind of brevity of which Horace approved, the conciseness that Hipparchus mentions, which consists in the avoidance of superfluities. There is no deliberate cult of the epigrammatic style, but Aratus does sometimes approach the *sententia*, as when he sums up the dangers of seafaring with the conceit 'a little timber fends off death', ὀλίγον δὲ διὰ ξύλον ῥ'Αἰδ' ἐρύκει (299). This is a variation of Homer's τυτθὸν γὰρ ὑπέκ θανάτοιο φέρονται (*Il.* xv, 628), and the writer of the *Περὶ Ὑψους* (10, 6) scoffs at Aratus for so minimizing the dangers of the sea, in comparison with Homer's uninhibited scenes of terror (e.g. in *Il* xv, 624-8). Nevertheless the line appealed to Juvenal, who turned the

thought into even more concise Latin with *tabula distinguitur unda* (14, 289).

The other aspect of Aratus's craftsmanship is his verbal artistry. Alliteration is frequent, not often overdone, as it perhaps is in a line like *πολλάκις ἐκ νηῶν πέλαγος περιπαπαίνοντες* (297), but more usually a more subtle flavouring, sometimes with patterns of two or more consonantal sounds, like the alteration of d, m, n and r in *ἡ διδύμη ἔζωσε διὰ μέγαν οὐρανὸν Ἴρις* (940). A triple sequence of consonants in three consecutive words is not uncommon, and must therefore be deliberate, e.g. *Δίκη δώτειρα δικάίων* (113), *πέλωρ ἐπελήλαται Ἴππος* (205), *νύκτα κατὰ νοτίην* (977), *ἀλήμονες ἄλλοθεν ἄλλοι* (1101). Other examples of conscious alliteration may be found with the consonants κ (952), μ (975), σπ (1024), φ (1149), χ (1152). Some play is made too with vowel sounds, for example the repetition of α in *ἄξων αἰὲν ἄρηρεν ἔχει δ' ἀτάλαντον ἀπάντη* (22), of ε in *ἄντρω ἐγκατέθεντο καὶ ἔτρεφον εἰς ἐνιαυτόν* (34), of η in *μηκέτι τοι τόδε σῆμα γαληναίης ἐπικεῖσθω* (1017), of ω in *ῶρη ὅθ' ἐσπερίη κρώζῃ πολύφωνα κορώνη* (1002), a sound pattern which has familiar echoes in Virgil. Examples of recurring diphthongs are also to be found, as of οι in 939 and αυ in 735.

Word patterns are frequent in the less technical passages. The anaphora in 7-8 is characteristic:

λέγει δ' ὅτε βῶλος ἀρίστη
βουσί τε καὶ μακέλῃσι, λέγει δ' ὅτε δεξιαὶ ὦραι . . .

Cf. 15-16, 73-4, 131-2, 141, 367, 481-2, 615, and the triple ἄλλος in 929-30:

ἦν δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι ἐναντίοι αἰίσσωσιν,
ἄλλοι δ' ἐξ ἄλλων μερέων . . .

There is also the balanced phrasing of the rhetorical text-books, with parallelism and chiasmus in about equal frequency. Among the more obvious examples of the former are 814:

ῥήγνυμένα ἀνέμοιο, μαραιομένη δὲ γαλήνης

and 1055:

πρῶτος μὲν πρώτην ἄροσιν, μέσσος δέ τε μέσσην.

Cf. also 842-3 and 934. An elaborate chiasmus involving the repetition of the same words stands out very early in the poem, 2-3:

μεσταὶ δὲ Διὸς πᾶσαι μὲν ἀγνυαί,
πᾶσαι δ' ἀνθρώπων ἀγοραί, μεστή δὲ θάλασσα . . .

and a similar pattern may be seen in 807-9, where the symmetry of

The Fame of Aratus

the words is ingeniously suited to the symmetry of the moon's phases, from first quarter to full and then from full to last quarter :

διχάδος γε μὲν ἄχρῃς ἐπ' αὐτὴν
σημαίνει διχόμενον, ἀτὰρ πάλιν ἐκ διχομήνου
ἐς διχάδα φθιμένην.

In view of the poet's liking for this sort of word-mosaic, it is not unreasonable to assume that his elaborate digression on Virgo as the goddess of Justice is deliberately placed within a symmetrical frame which associates the constellation with its near neighbour Bootes. At 96-7 we are told to look below the feet of Bootes to find Virgo :

ἀμφοτέροισι δὲ ποσσὶν ὑπο σκέπτοιο Βούτew
Παρθένον . . .

and forty lines later the passage is rounded off with the same two names in the reverse order (136), so leading the reader back to the point at which the digression began :

Παρθένος ἐγγὺς ἐοῦσα πολυσκέπτοιο Βούτew.

For chiasmus of a more ordinary kind, with contrasting adjectives and nouns, see 589, 897, 970, 1027; and with contrasting nouns and varied phrasing, 994-5.

Prominent among the artistries of Aratus is his technique of variation. In describing some 37 constellations, for example, he hardly ever repeats the formula with which he introduces them. A constellation simply 'is', or 'is fixed', or 'shines'; more often it has a verb of movement, such as *φέρεται*, *στρέφεται*, *κυλίνδεται*, etc.; sometimes it is given a verb to suit the character of the name, e.g. Sagittarius 'draws his bow', *Lepus* 'is hunted'; or again the reader is asked 'to observe' or 'to look for' the constellation. So it is too with the weather signs. The *De Signis*, from which Aratus derives his material, sticks mainly to the verb *σημαίνειν* and the formula 'such and such a sign denotes such and such weather.' Aratus gives us about 100 weather signs and expresses them in about 80 different ways. His permutations include the use of eleven different verbs for 'denote': *διδάσκειν*, *εἶρεν*, *φράσσεσθαι*, *σημαίνειν*, *κελεύειν*, *φέρειν*, *φορεῖν*, *λέγειν*, *φαίνειν*, *ἀπαγγέλλειν*, *μαντεύεσθαι*. He alternates three different tenses: present, aorist and future; active and passive voice; two moods, the indicative and the optative with *ἄν* or *κεν*, and the noun *σῆμα* with the verb understood. Again he has at his disposal a range of 16 personal verbs meaning 'expect' with all the associated nuances of hope and fear: *δεδιέναι*, *τεκμαίρεσθαι*, *δοκεῖν*, *δοκεύειν*, *μὴ ἀμνηστεῖν*, *σκέπαος*

χρηῆσθαι, περιτρομεῖν, μὴ λανθάνεσθαι, περισκοπεῖν, φυλάσσεσθαι, μὴ πιστεύειν, εἰπεῖν, περιδεδιέναι, ἔλπεσθαι, ἐπιέλπεσθαι, πυνθάνεσθαι. With these verbs the subject varies between the 2nd and 3rd person. Often the weather is the subject, and the verb denotes that it 'will come'; or again the weather may be expressed as a genitive absolute or by the dative of a noun, with or without a preposition, e.g. νότῳ (787). χειμῶνι (798), ἐφ' ὕδατι (873), ἐν χειμῶνι (998). Occasionally a subordinate clause is used, such as 'when you need a sunny day', ὅτ' εὐδίου κεχρημένος ἡματος εἷης (823), or a more elaborate amplification, as οὐκ ὀλίγῳ χειμῶνι τότε κλύζονται ἄρουραι, 'by no small storm are the crops then flooded' (902). There can be no doubt that Aratus made a special study of variations on a given theme: it is noticeable, for example, that the less obvious expressions tend to come towards the end of the section in which they are required, as if the poet used up the commoner ones first and found increasing difficulty in producing new variations as he went on.

This technique of variation clearly underlies the whole business of paraphrasing a prose work in verse, the art of the μεταφραστής, in which Aratus seems to have been a pioneer and a model for the Alexandrians and the Latin poets of the first century B.C. His method of dealing with Eudoxus can easily be studied, because Hipparchus's commentary quotes a number of parallel passages. These are presumably the passages in which the poet followed the subject-matter of his source most closely, and they make a revealing study for that very reason, because they show the pains that he took to make his language differ in every possible detail from that of his source.

Eudoxus says of the constellation Cygnus: παρὰ δὲ τὴν δεξιὰν χεῖρα τοῦ Κηφέως ἡ δεξιὰ πτέρυξ ἐστὶ τοῦ Ὀρνιθός, παρὰ δὲ τὴν ἀριστερὰν πτέρυγα οἱ πόδες τοῦ Ἰπποῦ. (Hipparchus, *Commentarii in Arati et Eudoxi Phaenomena* i. 2, 16). 'Beside the right hand of Cepheus is the right wing of Cygnus, and beside its left wing are the feet of Pegasus'. This is technical language, and the words and wording are both the most natural. Aratus follows the subject-matter very closely in 279-281:

κατὰ δεξιὰ χεῖρὸς
Κηφείης ταρσοῖο τὰ δεξιὰ πείρατα φαίνων,
λαίῃ δὲ πτέρυγι σκαρθμὸς παρακέκλιται Ἰπποῦ.

But his language shows variation in almost every detail. Where Eudoxus has παρὰ, Aratus writes κατὰ, although the two prepositions are metrically equivalent. For δεξιὰν χεῖρα, adjective agreeing with noun in the accusative, he substitutes the neuter plural

The Fame of Aratus

accusative δεξιὰ with the genitive of the noun, χειρός. The genitive of Cepheus is then transformed into the adjective Κηφείης, which has the same meaning. In dealing next with the right wing of Cygnus, Aratus succeeds in varying not only the cases, but the words as well. For πτέρυξ he puts ταρσός, which is properly a 'frame' of any kind, but used particularly of a wing structure, and he expands the single word for 'right' into δεξιὰ πείρατα, 'the right-hand edge'. The verb in Eudoxus is the plain ἐστί, but Aratus describes Cygnus as 'showing', φαίνων, its wing's edge, and the word also carries with it the suggestion of brightness. The second παρά of Eudoxus is then expanded into the verb παρακέκλιται, 'lies beside', thereby making possible a case variation into the dative πτέρυγι. For ἀριστερός, 'left', we find the less common, poetic synonym, λαιός, and instead of the literal πόδες, 'feet', the imaginative word σκαρθμός, 'prancing'. But right at the end, as if to show that all this has been deliberate variation, the poet reproduces his original exactly with Ἴππου, the same word, the same case, and the same position.

A comparison of the *Diosemeia* with the *De Signis* gives similar illustrations of the same technique. Here Aratus is less tied to the arrangement of the subject-matter, and any given passage may draw its contents from a number of different places in the original. For example, in 938-945 Aratus gives a list of five signs that preceded rain: fleecy clouds, a double rainbow, a dark halo round a star, lake and sea birds splashing in the water, and swallows diving. All of these are in the *De Signis*, but no two are consecutive: the fleecy clouds come from section 13, the double rainbow is a variation on the 'many rainbows' in section 22, the dark halo appears at the very end of the same section, the splashing birds are to be found at the beginning of 15, though there they are not birds that live on the water, and the swallows belong to the middle of the same section. ...

Now compare in detail the first of these weather signs in the two authors. In *De Signis* it is expressed quite simply:

ὅταν νεφέλαι πόκοις ἐρίων ὅμοιαι ᾧσιν, ὕδωρ σημαίνει.

'When clouds are like fleeces of wool, it is a sign of rain.' Aratus fills this out to make a couplet, and every word in the original undergoes some kind of variation:

πολλάκι δ' ἐρχομένων ὑετῶν νέφεα προπάροισιν
οἶα μάλιστα πόκοισιν εἰκότα ἰνδάλλονται, (938-9)

'Often before the coming of rain clouds appear exactly like fleeces.' In the first place the subordinate clause has become the princi-

pal clause and the principal clause a genitive participle with *προπάροιθεν*. Then *νεφέλαι* is varied with *νέφεα, πόκοις* has a slight change into the epic form of the dative, *ἐρίων* is omitted, and *ὄμοιαι* becomes *εὐικότα*. The plain verb 'to be' is now replaced by the more interesting Homeric word *ἰνδάλλεσθαι*, and in the place of the acc. sing. neut. *ὕδωρ* we find the gen.pl. masc. *ὕετων*. Finally, we observe that the technical verb *σημαίνει*, which recurs almost invariably throughout the *De Signis*, is here eliminated by the different construction that Aratus gives to his sentence.

Aratus was then a scholars' poet, and it is not difficult to see why he appealed to the Alexandrians. But if it was his literary artifices that gained him his reputation in the first instance, it was his Stoicism and his plain star-lore that maintained it for so long. Nowadays he has lapsed into complete obscurity, except for the interest of a few scholars, and this is because the intrinsic appeal of the *Phaenomena* has become obsolete on each count. He has long been superseded as a text-book on astronomy, and even as a descriptive guide to the constellations. His Stoicism has been superseded by Christianity, which has made his Zeus seem primitive. And his literary technique has not been sufficient in itself to give the poet immortality, without the fire of a creative imagination or the note of human sympathy that makes great poetry universal. It remains, however, true that Aratus did play a significant part in the evolution of Greek literature and had a calculable influence on the perfection of Latin poetic technique. For this reason alone he merits the attention of all who study the Hellenistic and Augustan poets.

NOTES

¹ The text is available in editions by Maass, E. (2nd ed. Berlin, Weidmann, 1955); Mair, G. R. (London, Heinemann, 1921, with Callimachus and Lycophron); and Martin, J. (Florence, 1956).

² Maass, E., *Commentariorum in Aratum Reliquiae* (2nd ed. Berlin, Weidmann, 1958), pp. 77 and 148-9. ³ *ibid.*, p. 77.

⁴ *Anthologia Palatina*, ix, 25. ⁵ Maass, *op. cit.*, p. 79.

⁶ Morel, W. *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum* (2nd ed. Leipzig, Teubner, 1927, p. 89).

⁷ Maass, *op. cit.*, p. 318. ⁸ *ibid.*, pp. 70 and 80. ⁹ *ibid.*, p. 150.

¹⁰ *Acts of the Apostles*, xvii, 28. ¹¹ Maass, *op. cit.*, p. 324.

¹² *Ancient Greek Literature* (London, Heinemann, 1897), p. 386.

¹³ (London, O.U.P., 1933).

¹⁴ *Greece and Rome*, xx (1951), 26. ¹⁵ *Ars Poetica*, 408-9 and 291-3.

¹⁶ *Commentarii in Arati et Eudoxi Phaenomena* (ed. Manitius, Leipzig, Teubner, 1894), i, 1, 4 and 7.

¹⁷ e.g. *De Oratore*, iii, 39.

¹⁸ e.g. most recently Martin, J., *op. cit.*, p. 176: 'l'Océan, sur ses deux bords, . . .' ¹⁹ *Il.* xii, 454-6; *Od.* xxi, 47-50.

VALÉRY'S 'ÉBAUCHE D'UN SERPENT'

A. R. CHISHOLM

University of Melbourne

OSTENSIBLY, *Ebauche d'un serpent* is a piece of pure logic. Satan, an implacable analyst, who believes that life is futile because it passes back eventually into nothingness, blames God for having debased His own pure Being by creating the universe and living things. God, he argues in stanzas 6 and 9, has done this out of vanity; He had wearied of His lonely perfection, and made Himself visible; He had thirsted for praise, and created man so that He might have someone to laud Him for His works:

O vanité! Cause Première!
Celui qui règne dans les Cieux,
D'une voix qui fut la lumière
Ouvrit l'univers spacieux.
Comme las de son pur spectacle,
Dieu lui-même a rompu l'obstacle
De sa parfaite éternité.

.....
En vain, Vous avez, dans la fange,
Pétri de faciles enfants,
Qui de Vos actes fissent louange!

There is, however, a lapse in this logic. For, after stating in stanza 7 that God's very first creative word (*Fiat lux*) had really created Satan (i.e. Lucifer), whose business was to undermine creation:

Mais, le premier mot de son Verbe,
MOI! . . . Des astres le plus superbe
Qu'ait parlés le fou créateur,

he goes on to say that he had loved God while He remained pure Being:

Objet radieux de ma haine,
Vous que j'aimais éperdument . . .
(Stanza 8).

The flaw in this reasoning is obvious. In order to have loved God in His lonely perfection, Satan must have existed before the Creation, and therefore before Lucifer, who is really himself. Nor can this be explained away by saying that Satan is at his old game of misusing Scripture for his own purposes; for throughout the

poem he regrets the purity of God *which he had once known*. The explanation of this is, I think, that in *Ebauche* God and the Serpent are two aspects, positive and negative respectively, of the same eternal entity. And what here replaces the logic of analysis is the logic of poetry—the kind of logic which, in *Le cimetière marin*, reconciles Being and Non-being, life and nothingness, feeling and intellect. It bears much the same relation to analytical logic as *esprit de finesse* bears to *esprit de géométrie*. And it is by the interplay of these two logics that *Ebauche*, like Valéry's other major poems, is built. We find them constantly correcting or supplementing each other.

Thus in stanza 4 Satan praises the sun because its light creates phantoms of sensuous but unreal delight, and these cause man to subordinate his soul to his senses, so that he is lured away from the worship of God as pure Being:

Grand Soleil,

 Fauteur des fantômes joyeux
 Qui rendent sujette des yeux
 La présence obscure de l'âme,
 Toujours le mensonge m'a plu
 Que tu répands sur l'absolu,
 O roi des ombres fait de flamme!

But Satan himself is bewitched by the *real* beauty of light and shade, and lingers lovingly over it, when in stanza 24 he watches Eve. The shadow of the Tree falls on one of her breasts, while the other gleams in the sunlight like the pistil of a flower:

Quel silence battu d'un cil!
 Mais quel souffle sous le sein sombre
 Que mordait l'Arbre de son ombre!
 L'autre brillait comme un pistil!
 —*Siffle, siffle!* me chantait-il!
 Et je sentais frémir le nombre,
 Tout le long de mon fouet subtil,
 De ces replis dont je m'encombre:
 Ils roulaient depuis le béryl
 De ma crête, jusqu'au péril!

I open a parenthesis here to remark that the two concluding lines of this stanza are curious. Logically, one would expect 'depuis le béryl . . . jusqu'au péril' to mean: from the Serpent's head to his tail, travelling along his many coils. But a serpent is not like

Valéry's 'Ebauche d'un serpent'

a scorpion: its tail is not dangerous. The sudden twist that gives 'péril' where we expect quite a different word is perhaps a deliberate piece of burlesque, like the jingle in stanza 19:

Dore, langue, dore-lui les
Plus doux des dits que tu connaises!

We should remember, in this context, that in a letter to Alain (4-1-1930) Valéry himself speaks of the partly burlesque character of the Serpent's monologue; and he quotes 'Dore, langue . . .' as an example of burlesque in an interview with Aimé Lafont, recorded in *Le Figaro* (19-7-1952) after the poet's death. But the intention in 'béryl . . . péril' is also more than burlesque. It seems to me that 'péril' here has the special meaning quoted by Littré among his definitions of the term: 'Il se dit des craintes que l'on court d'être saisi de sentiments amoureux'. This interpretation is confirmed in stanza 14, where the Serpent says of Eve:

Jusques à moi, tu m'attendris,
De qui relèvent les vampires!

To come back to our main argument: pure logic has fallen into the trap of sensibility. Or, to put it in another way, Valéry here exemplifies one of his most characteristic and original tenets, namely that there is such a thing as a *sensibility of the intellect*,—even, in this instance, of the most nihilistic intellect. The negative intellect can vibrate, what denies can also create and be thrilled by its own creations, by the images that it weaves out of what it believes to be nothing. The poet refers to this strange process as a 'nihilisme bizarrement constructeur' in *Méditation avant pensée* (*Poésie brute*).

And it is this special logic, this intellectual sensibility, that maintains, in stanza 25, the beautiful image of Eve's two breasts, one shaded by the Tree, the other shining in the sunlight. As Eve's white body, aspiring towards the Tree, reaches up towards its fruit, her golden head is thrown back; and her breasts, one shaded ('ombre'), the other gleaming ('ambre'), tremble in half-delightful, half-fearful anticipation.

Le marbre aspire, l'or se cambre!
Ces blondes bases d'ombre et d'ambre
Tremblent au bord du mouvement!

The Serpent may condemn God for His works, but he is singularly fascinated by them!

* * * *

We know Valéry's love for trees, and his frequent use of the tree, aspiring skywards but held by its roots, as a symbol of human consciousness: for example, in *La jeune Parque* and in *Au Platane*. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Tree is the very core of *Ebauche*. Satan, as he says himself, is no more than a voice whispering among its foliage (i.e. in the thoughts of man):

Le plus rusé des animaux
Qui te raille d'être si dure,
O perfide et grosse de maux,
N'est qu'une voix dans la verdure!

(Stanza 22).

Being a negation and a mere voice, having no shape, he is, in the opening stanza, like a mechanical serpent (cf. the artificial serpent in the stage directions of the *Mystère d'Adam*) in an ordinary tree ('arbre' has no capital in stanza 1, though it was printed as 'Arbre' in the *N.R.F.* text of 1921). But as the poem progresses, both tree and serpent increase in stature and become, respectively, the 'Grand Arbre' of stanza 28 and the 'Toute-Puissance du Néant' of stanza 31.

It is from the Tree that Satan sees Eve, and it is to the Tree that she comes to hear his murmuring voice. The symbolical significance of this is that her consciousness is blossoming, and within it she is beginning to find the irresistible appeal of life and beauty and sensuous delight; though within it also is latent the thought of mortality, presently to be cunningly suggested by the Serpent:

Eve, jadis, je la surpris,
Parmi ses premières pensées, «
La lèvre entr'ouverte aux esprits
Qui naissaient des roses bercées

(Stanza 13);

Du plaisir que tu te proposes .
Cède, cher corps, cède aux appâts!
Que ta soif de métamorphoses
Autour de l'Arbre du Trépas
Engendre une chaîne de poses!

(Stanza 26).

The Tree is more than the Tree of Knowledge. It is the Tree of Consciousness, made up of intellect and sensibility, thought and instinct, reason and emotion. Only for Satan, the spirit of negation, is it the Tree of Death. The profound difference between the Serpent (nihilistic intellect) and the Tree (the human mind) is brought

out in stanzas 28 to 30. Apostrophising the Tree, which pierces the subterranean rocks in its search for nourishment (just as man probes his deep self), and which moves up to the call of its own sunlit foliage (just as man follows his spiritual aspirations), the Serpent says:

Tu peux repousser l'infini
Qui n'est fait que de ta croissance,
Et de la tombe jusqu'au nid
Te sentir toute Connaissance!

'Tombe' here denotes not only the deep earth where the Tree is rooted, but also, I think, pre-natal nothingness; while 'nid' (the nest in the tree-top) is the symbol of procreation. And what a man learns in the interval between receiving life and bequeathing it, along with his acquired knowledge, to posterity, is his only infinite. But the Serpent is not willing to leave him even this, and turns knowledge itself into bitterness and despair:

Mais ce vieil amateur d'échecs,
Dans l'or oisif des soleils secs,
Sur ton branchage vient se tordre;
Ses yeux font frémir ton trésor.
Il en cherra des fruits de mort,
De désespoir et de désordre!

('Echecs' has here, no doubt, a double meaning. We can take it to signify that the Devil loves *frustrations*; or that, as in many legends, he plays *chess* with man for his soul. 'Se tordre' also is two-edged: it means *to writhe*, as a serpent does, or *to laugh* maliciously. This word-play is possibly another example of burlesque).

* * * *

There are three personages in *Ebauche*: God, Man and Serpent. Each has two aspects. God is, on the one hand, pure Spirit, and on the other hand, a spirit that splits its purity into phenomena and minds. Man is a body with senses (Eve), and at the same time a mind (the Tree). The Serpent is cold intellect, but also has something that closely resembles sensibility. And though in stanzas 6-8 Satan says that he hates God for having created the world and humanity, his real hatred is reserved for man, who, although he is a mere puppet, can become almost a god through his combination of intellect, sensuality and sensibility. In spite of himself, Satan admires man, and we have seen him almost in love with Eve. But above all, he envies him, no doubt because he is capable of enthusiasm, emotion, creativeness.

Only thus, I believe, can we explain the final stanza (added after the first publication of the poem in the *N.R.F.* in July 1921, where the last three lines of stanza 30 were so conceived as to constitute a conclusion):

Beau serpent, bercé dans le bleu,
Je siffle, avec délicatesse,
Offrant à la gloire de Dieu
Le triomphe de ma tristesse . . .
Il me suffit que dans les airs,
L'immense espoir de fruits amers
Affole les fils de la fange . . .
—Cette soif qui te fit géant,
Jusqu'à l'Etre exalte l'étrange
Toute-Puissance du Néant!

The intention of this final stanza is, I think, as follows: Satan has striven against God, yet he is compelled to offer to God's glory the triumph constituted by his own melancholy. There is no joy in his work of destruction, and he has to content himself with the thought that he has spoilt man's enjoyment of life by means of his subtle negations. The three concluding lines, boastful though they seem, are a confession of defeat. Satan has made himself God's equal, inasmuch as God made man and he has remoulded him; but is this 'Toute-Puissance du Néant' really greater than what it has corrupted, or even as great?

In less theological terms, the Serpent is that negative aspect of thought which tells us that nothing is worth while, because we are mere mortals. But thought has other aspects. It discovers that even mortality is worth while, that life is intrinsically beautiful. And Valéry's poem, though it seems utterly pessimistic, is packed with magnificent vitalistic images, through which the whisperings of the Serpent run like a persistent but ineffectual current of bitterness, just as the thought of death runs through life but cannot prevent our enjoyment of it. Satan himself realises this in stanza 27, where his enjoyment of his own malice is 'infertile', while that of man (the Tree) is, though a mixture of pure intellect ('sagesse') and imaginative sensibility ('illusions'), unlimited and ecstatic:

O follement que je m'offrais
Cette infertile jouissance . . .
.....
Déjà délivrant son essence
De sagesse et d'illusions,
Tout l'Arbre de la Connaissance

Valéry's 'Ebauche d'un serpent'

Echevelé de visions,
Agitait son grand corps qui plonge
Au soleil, et suce le songe!

Once more, as in *Le Cimetière marin* and *La jeune Parque*, Valéry has subordinated pure logic, which is negative with regard to life, to the logic of vitalism and poetry.

And he is right. Human consciousness owes its peculiar savour, in a large measure, to the overcoming of its inner negations. Man is the only creature who is fully conscious of his own mortality; and *therefore* he is the only creature who is truly creative. He stylises the very negations to which he is subjected, and thus makes them positive. He stylises Hazard into Fate, and out of the idea of Fate he builds tragedy, which is an art-form of a very high order. He stylises his very imperfections, and the nostalgias which they engender, and they become an Eden of poetry.

The Serpent consequently turns the tables on himself. By persuading man to eat of the Fruit, and thus giving him an awareness of his mortality, he is really putting into his hands that instrument of creativeness which, sharpened by insight into the transient character of life, has created human culture and humanised the centuries. Satan, conceived as the negative aspect of intellect, is like the drop of strychnine that is put into certain medicines to give them a specific potency.

We can thus quote against him (just as he quotes Scripture against God) his own words in the first stanza of *Ebauche*, and say that his venom 'laisse loin la sage ciguë'.

* * * *

An interesting problem presented by this poem is that of determining to what extent the Serpent is Valéry himself. Some useful light is thrown on it by the *Petite lettre sur les mythes*, first published as an introduction to Maurice de Guérin's *Poèmes en prose* in 1928, and republished a year later in *Variété II*. In it, after discussing the inevitability of myths and fancies, Valéry writes:

Que serions-nous sans le secours de ce qui n'existe pas? Peu de chose, et nos esprits bien inoccupés languiraient si les fables, les méprises, les abstractions, les croyances et les monstres, les hypothèses et les prétendus problèmes de la métaphysique ne peuplaient d'êtres et d'images sans objet nos profondeurs et nos ténèbres naturelles.

Here there is a pointer to one of the differences between the poet and his malicious personage. The Serpent, when he is wholly

himself, wholly negative, is different from Valéry in that he rejects all acts of creation, refusing to people his 'natural darkness'. Hence his bitter challenge to God when, reproaching Him (stanza 8) with the futility of His creation, he says: 'Regardez-vous dans ma ténèbre!' For in this dark, unpeopled mirror the cosmos is nothingness.

But even the Serpent is not always negative, as we have seen. Though he believes that the creation is a stupid myth, he reacts to its sheer beauty. And when he does that, he ceases to be himself. He is no longer pure, negative, destructive intellect. He is a poet. He is Valéry.

The Serpent has another characteristic which is decidedly Valéryan. With his implacable realism he destroys all appearances; but at the same time he watches himself destroying them, and to watch one's self is to create a further self (cf. Rimbaud's 'JE est un autre'). 'Cette guivre qui me déguise', in stanza 2, is a symbol of this duality. Moreover, the whole poem is retrospective: Satan tells how he corrupted man, and in his monologue he watches himself doing it.

We find Valéry thus doubling himself in *Le Cimetière marin*, where he calls on one of his selves to replace another:

Brisez, mon corps, cette forme pensive!

And this process is carried still further in *La jeune Parque*, when the Parque (who is already, to a large extent, one of the poet's selves) says: 'Je me voyais me voir'. *Je, me, me* are here three different selves, though they are still aspects of the one Self. . . How difficult it is to seize in its completeness such a mentality as Valéry's, which has so many elusive quances and which in *Ebauche* exteriorises itself in a symbolic figure without entirely identifying itself with this creature of its imagination! For this reason the seemingly over-modest term 'Ebauche', which precedes the title (in the *N.R.F.* plaque of 1922 the poem was simply called *Le Serpent*), is actually most appropriate.

* * * *

It would be unfair to Valéry not to draw attention to the structural consistency of this rather long poem. The logic, both formal and poetic, which has been discussed earlier in the present study, binds the various stanzas together in a most satisfying way, giving *Ebauche* that organic quality that distinguishes a still longer composition, *La jeune Parque*. Every stanza prepares the way for a stanza, or a group of stanzas, that will come later.

Thus Satan's disguise as an artificial serpent (stanzas 1 and 2)

Valéry's 'Ebauche d'un serpent'

is never forgotten. He is always conscious of this disguise, looking on it as something external which he can watch, or to which he can listen:

Je m'écoute, et dans mes circuits,
Ma méditation murmure
(Stanza 5);

Et je sentais frémir le nombre,
Tout le long de mon fouet subtil,
De ces replis dont je m'encombre
(Stanza 24).

A more subtle example of this consistency is the repetition of 'Cette soif qui . . .' (stanza 21) in the final stanza. In stanza 21 the Serpent whispers to Eve:

Que si ta bouche fait un rêve,
Cette soif qui songe à la sève,
Ce délice à demi futur,
C'est l'éternité fondante, Eve!

And without these lines it would be easy to understand the line in stanza 31 where the Serpent, addressing himself, speaks of 'Cette soif qui te fit géant'. It was not, as one might hastily conclude, his own thirst that enlarged him, but Eve's thirst for the Fruit. For her desire enabled him to corrupt mankind, to remould what God had created and thus make himself equal to the Creator. Notice also that this remoulding of man, which exalts the Serpent 'jusqu'à l'Etre', is itself the fulfilment of a prediction in stanza 10:

Je suis Celui qui modifie.
Je retouche au cœur qui s'y fie,
D'un doigt sûr et mystérieux!

Incidentally, the line in stanza 21 quoted above, 'C'est l'éternité fondante, Eve!', could easily lead to a misunderstanding if we forgot the ruthless consistency of the Serpent's guile. 'L'éternité fondante' *could* mean the destruction of eternal life, the curse of mortality; and indeed that is the secret meaning that the Serpent reserves for it. But what he wants Eve to understand by it is this: 'This anticipated delight, this fruit that you can already feel melting in your mouth, is the sweet taste of eternity'. The same metaphor is used (a further illustration of Valéry's consistency) in *Le Cimetière marin*, stanza 5, where a fruit changes into something greater and more subtle than itself as it melts in the mouth, its essence being sweeter than its material form:

A. R. Chisholm

Comme le fruit se fond en jouissance,
Comme en délice il change son absence
Dans une bouche où sa forme se meurt . . .

To take another example of the poem's organic quality: the sun, as Satan sees it in stanza 3, is the latter's accomplice ('le plus fier de mes complices'); for the special, visual beauty that it creates prevents man from realising that

. . . l'univers n'est qu'un défaut
Dans la pureté du Non-être!

It thus makes Eve ready to listen to the Serpent's 'fables' about eternal life. And so Satan is quite consistent when he says in stanza 5:

Verse-moi ta brute chaleur,
Où vient ma paresse glacée
Rêvasser de quelque malheur
Selon ma nature enlacée . . .

What he is really asking the sun to do is to lend him some of its power of metamorphosis and subtle deception, so that, disguised as a serpent, he may use to the full the serpent's legendary gift of fascination. *How* he uses this power is told in stanza 15, where Eve is like a bird succumbing to the baleful stare of a snake, while Satan adopts the very language of birds in order to bewitch her:

Oui! De mon poste de feuillage
Reptile aux extases d'oiseau,
Cependant que mon babillage
Tissait de ruses le réseau,
Je te buvais, ô belle sourde! '

And again, the sun is the Whisperer's accomplice, the begetter of misleading dreams, in stanza 27, where the Tree (Consciousness) plunges its foliage into the sunlight and 'suce le songe'.

Finally, the picture of Eve is beautifully consistent throughout the poem. We first see her in stanza 13, and what is most noticeable about her is 'Son flanc vaste et d'or parcouru'. She is thus a lovely vessel of life and fecundity, and consequently, a vessel of mortality and of the evils that beset life; and this makes the invocation in stanza 22 quite consistent: 'O perfide et grosse de maux'. The idea of a vessel is found again in stanza 25: 'Elle chancelle, la grande urne'; while 'chancelle' itself echoes a line in stanza 16:

O chair mollement décidée,
Sans que je t'eusse intimidée,
A chanceler dans la splendeur!

Valéry's 'Ebauche d'un serpent'

This image of an urn is, moreover, maintained in stanza 26. When the Serpent is inviting Eve to yield to the manifold solicitations of life, he sees her as a great vase filled and weighed down by the roses of passion, maternity, life, vicissitudes, mortality:

Viens sans venir; forme des pas
Vaguement comme lourds de roses . . .

And 'lourds' here echoes a line that describes Eve in stanza 51:

Calme, claire, de charmes lourde.

In these many ways, my earlier remarks about the sensibility of the intellect are borne out. Valéry *thinks out* his poem with a logic that never flags, binding all its parts together in a lucid sequence. But at the same time he conceals or modifies this logical framework, clothes it in fine raiment, thanks to the warmth, the richness and the felicitous variety of his images, thanks to the incantatory splendour of his words. He thus fully justifies the apostrophe to language (the instrument of both thought and sensibility) which we find in the closing stanza of *La Pythie*:

Honneur des Hommes, Saint LANGUAGE,
Discours prophétique et paré,
Belles chaînes en qui s'engage
Le Dieu dans la chair égaré,
Illumination, largesse!

CURTIUS RUFUS AND THE 'HISTORIAE ALEXANDRI'

G. V. SUMNER

University of Canterbury

THE question of the date when Curtius' history of Alexander the Great was written has long been debated and cannot be said to have been settled.¹ Two things are certain: the author lived under a Princeps, and he wrote while the Parthian Empire was still in existence, therefore before A.D. 227. In one passage he mentions that the Parthians now rule all who live beyond the Euphrates and Tigris rivers (as far as the Mare Rubrum).² So it is virtually certain that he wrote before the time of the Severi, who claimed Mesopotamia as a Roman province; highly probable that he antedated Marcus Aurelius, who set up a Roman protectorate there; and probably safe to put him before Trajan, who made the decisive break with the traditional acceptance of the Euphrates as the frontier between the two Empires. The general consensus of modern opinion is that Curtius' date falls within the first hundred odd years of the Principate, from Augustus to Vespasian. The question is whether it is possible to determine more narrowly within those limits the time when the *Historiae Alexandri* was composed.

Curtius' book is not mentioned by any surviving ancient authority. Evidence of date has been looked for in references to men bearing all or part of the name which is given to the writer in some of the manuscripts,—Q. Curtius Rufus; in parallels between the *Historiae* and the works of other writers; and in general considerations relating to the style, language and content of the book. But it is found that these things lack certainty and precision as temporal indices. The main clues, in fact, are provided by a passage near the end of the work, when the writer digresses briefly to comment on the circumstances of his own time:

1. sed iam fatis admovebantur Macedonum genti bella civilia; nam et insociabile est regnum et a pluribus expetebatur. 2. primum ergo collegere vires, deinde disperserunt; et cum pluribus corpus quam capiebat onerassent, cetera membra deficere coeperunt, quodque imperium sub uno stare potuisset, dum a pluribus sustinetur, ruit.

3. proinde iure meritoque populus Romanus salutem se principi suo debere profitetur, qui noctis quam paene supremam habuimus

novum sidus illuxit. 4. huius hercule, non solis, ortus lucem caliganti reddidit mundo, cum sine suo capite discordia membra trepidarent. 5. quot ille tum exstinxit faces! quot condidit gladios! quantam tempestatem subita serenitate discussit! non ergo revirescit solum, sed etiam floret imperium. 6. absit modo invidia, excipiet huius saeculi tempora eiusdem domus utinam perpetua, certe diuturna posteritas.

7. ceterum ut ad ordinem a quo me contemplatio publicae felicitatis averterat redeam . . . (X, 9, 1-7)³

This is a rhetorical passage, and it calls for a sensitive handling—which it has not always received. I begin with a close translation, adding some interpretation to clarify matters:

'But already the Fates were bringing civil wars upon the Macedonian nation. For monarchy cannot be shared, and to the monarchy there were many aspirants. First, therefore, they gathered forces, then dispersed them. And when they had loaded the body (of the Empire) with more than it could hold, the limbs also (the various regions of the Empire) began to fail (and fall away—*deficere* in two senses), and the Empire—which could have stood firm under a single ruler—while being maintained by several, went down to ruin.

Therefore, justly and deservedly the Roman people declare that they owe salvation to their Princeps, who shone forth as a new star—of the night which was almost our last. It was his rising, indeed, not the sun's, that restored light to a world in darkness, when the limbs (the various regions of the Empire) without their head (Princeps) were in discord and agitation. How many firebrands he then extinguished! How many swords he sheathed! What a great storm he dispelled with a sudden clearing of the skies! Consequently, the Empire is not merely again growing green and vigorous, it is even in full bloom. Provided only envy ('nemesis'—cf. IX, 2, 29) is withheld, the posterity of this same house will succeed to the (happy) days of the present age—in perpetuity as we hope and pray, certainly for a long, long time.

But to return to the orderly sequence of my narrative, from which I was diverted by contemplation of the public felicity, . . .'

The fundamental issue is this. When Curtius switches from the civil wars that caused the break-up of Alexander's Empire to the situation at Rome, does he imply that the advent of the new Princeps terminated a period of *actual* civil war in the Roman Empire? Or does he rather imply that the new Princeps gave

salvation to the Roman people by *preventing* a threatened outbreak of civil war? - If the former, then it remains to choose between the Emperors Augustus and Vespasian, who both ended civil wars. If the latter, the only suitable Emperor is Claudius, since Galba is excluded by the reference to 'posterity'.

If no allowance is made for the exaggeration essential to rhetoric, the first interpretation appears quite plausible. But when that necessary allowance is made, it becomes obvious that Curtius' language is far too restrained to refer to the terrible civil wars ended by Augustus and Vespasian respectively. Even in flat, literal prose, *discordia membra trepidarent*, which Tarn regards as the clinching factor,⁴ would appear something of an understatement. As rhetoric for the chaos of the civil wars, it would be ludicrously inadequate. To this it may be added that *sine suo capite* implies quite clearly a hiatus between the end of the reign of one Princeps and the accession of the next. This will certainly not fit Augustus, who had no predecessor; nor is it very suitable for Vespasian, who dated his own accession from July 1, A.D. 69, that is, during the reign of Vitellius, whose legitimacy he had himself acknowledged.⁵

These difficulties do not arise if Claudius is Curtius' Princeps. The Roman people owed salvation to Claudius for saving it from competition for the unsharable throne by such men as Valerius Asiaticus and M. Vinicius. The situation after the assassination of Gaius had borne an unpleasant resemblance to that after the murder of an earlier Gaius, with the same ingredients of an uncertain Senate, a band of visionary liberators, and a number of powerful and ambitious individuals. The house of Augustus was apparently finished, but lo! a new—and unexpected—star was born, the neglected Claudius. *Noctis quam paene supremam hubuimus* has a figurative sense,⁶ but Curtius is clearly thinking, too, of the night of January 24/25, A.D. 41, when Rome was without a Princeps, and the worst was to be anticipated. The following day the storm-clouds were instantaneously dispelled when it was revealed that the Praetorian Guard had found a new Emperor—and paymaster. At his very rising (*ortus . . . tum*) the new star extinguished the figurative fires of portended war (but also the real torches that had blazed all night in the Forum and on the Capitol with the same portent), and sheathed the figurative swords of threatened civil war (but also the actually drawn swords of the German bodyguard, and of the Urban and Praetorian Cohorts whose clash had been an imminent danger).⁷

Several scholars have observed that it is difficult to resist the conclusion that with the phrase *caliganti mundo* Curtius is making

an extraordinary word-play on the nickname of the Emperor Gaius. Naturally this should not be put forward as a proof of the Claudius-hypothesis. But Claudius would have been the man to appreciate it, judging by his grotesque play with the name Allobrogicus in the speech preserved on the Lyons Tablet.⁸ That *caliganti mundo* is not only a world in a fog of uncertainty and fear, but also a world suffering from the effects of Caligula, helps to explain *discordia membra trepidarent*. Gaius bequeathed to Claudius disturbances in several parts of the Empire—Judaea, Alexandria, Mauretania. But, of course, the phrase refers as much to the readily apprehensible results of having no Princeps at the head of the Empire.

That Curtius in this passage refers to the Emperor Claudius is no new theory, and could in fact be described as generally accepted.⁹ But I think it is possible to go further and assign a more precise date to the composition of the *Historiae*. The key is in *non ergo revirescit solum, sed etiam floret imperium*. 'The world not only grows green again but flowers (i.e. Curtius was writing quite a time after the Emperor's accession)'; thus Tarn, again ignoring the rhetoric and treating it as plain statement.¹⁰ The word to note is *ergo*. Because the new Emperor, like the sun, brought with his rising a *subita serenitas* dispelling the storm-clouds, therefore . . . It is not a question of a gradual recovery; *suddenly* the Empire blooms again. In other words, the exact opposite of Tarn's inference is to be drawn. The passage was written soon after the Emperor's accession.¹¹

An interesting conclusion follows. If the penultimate chapter of the last book of the *Historiae* was written soon after Claudius came to the throne, it becomes highly probable that the bulk of the work was composed during the reign of Gaius.

This insight illuminates a number of points. Why was the book ever written, poses Tarn.¹² Part of the answer is that it provided a clever way of attacking Gaius in safety. Gaius had identified himself with Alexander by parading in the Macedonian's breastplate taken from the sarcophagus at Alexandria.¹³ Gaius was an Emperor who began well, but whose character after a certain point had sharply deteriorated, according to his contemporaries and later writers.¹⁴ Such, in the main, is the portrait Curtius, drawing on the Peripatetic tradition, presents of Alexander. He was good up to the death of Darius, we are led to believe, but then he became corrupted by oriental ways. The second half of the work is marked by considerable hostility to Alexander, especially over the killing of Parmenio, Clitus, and Callisthenes.¹⁵ There is no point in instituting a search for exact parallels. General resemblances in

the situation will have sufficed for Curtius' audience. Passages such as III, 12, 19 and VI, 2, 1-4 gain added bite when it is seen that these measured criticisms of the Macedonian were meant to be transferred by Curtius' hearers and readers to the reigning Emperor.

The present hypothesis also suggests a way of solving the contradiction between Curtius' general portrayal of Alexander's character and his obituary on the dead monarch (X, 5, 26 ff.).¹⁶ It is to be assumed that the section of the work from X, 5 to the end was written after Gaius' assassination and under the new Emperor. There was now no point in continuing the veiled polemic against Gaius. Its purpose had been served. Claudius' attitude to Alexander is not on record. But we can take into account his ardent philhellenism and the affection for Alexander's great Egyptian foundation professed in the Letter to the Alexandrians.¹⁷ We can note, too, the admiration of Alexander expressed by Augustus,¹⁸ Claudius' great exemplar, and implied by Claudius' own grandfather, Mark Antony, who named one of his sons Alexander Helios. It is at least not inconceivable that a fairly favourable judgment of Alexander recommended itself to the historian-emperor—or that Curtius had reason to assume it would. At any rate he plays it safe, and with a characteristic disregard for consistency falls into line with the conventional attitude indicated, for example, by his contemporary Valerius Maximus.¹⁹ A rhetorical flood in praise of Alexander gushes forth.

It is to be noted that there is other clear evidence of the influence of recent events on Curtius' mind when he was writing his history. In the very full treatment of the conspiracy that led to the downfall of Philotas and Parmenio, he produces a speech by Philotas' friend Amyntas which in theme and language bears an extraordinarily close resemblance to the famous defence of M. Terentius against the charge of *Seiani amicitia*. The most striking example of the coincidence is between Curtius' *amicitiam quae nobis cum Philota fuit adeo non eo infitias, ut expetisse quoque nos magnosque ex ea fructus percepisse confitear*, and (in Tacitus' version) *fatebor et fuisse me Seiano amicum et ut essem expetisse et postquam adeptus eram laetatum*,—(in Dio's) οὐχ ὅσον οὐκ ἡρνήσατο, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔφη καὶ σπονδάσαι μάλιστα αὐτὸν καὶ θεραπεύσαι.²⁰ And the whole line of argument is similar for the two speeches. Nor is this a case of writers producing the same commonplaces. Tacitus makes it plain that Terentius' thesis was startlingly, even perilously, original. It is clear that Curtius has deliberately made use of the Roman knight's

speech, delivered only a few years before Curtius wrote the *Historiae*.

It appears reasonably certain, then, that the author of the *Historiae Alexandri* lived for part of his life under Tiberius (he may, of course, have been born during the Augustan period), wrote during the reign of Gaius, and completed the work early in the principate of Claudius. Now, the Index prefaced to Suetonius' *De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus* gives, after the names of the five rhetoricians whose biographies are preserved in the main text, the following names: L. Cestius Pius, M. Porcius Latro, Q. Curtius Rufus, L. Valerius Primanus, Verginius Flavus . . . etc.²¹ The list is in chronological order. Jerome puts Cestius Pius' *floruit* in 13 B.C. Porcius Latro, who taught Ovid, was a friend and contemporary of the elder Seneca and died in 4 B.C., according to Jerome.²² About the rhetor L. Valerius Primanus, who follows Q. Curtius Rufus, nothing is known. The next in the list, Verginius Flavus, was teaching Persius from about 46, according to Suetonius' Life of the poet, and at the height of his fame was exiled by Nero in 65.²³ It may be inferred, then, that Q. Curtius Rufus was active sometime during the period from Augustus (the latter part of the reign) to Claudius. As far as the dates go, he could have been the author of the *Historiae*. And it is obvious that the book was written by a man steeped in rhetoric.

Tacitus (*Annales* XI. 20-21) gives biographical details of a man of some eminence whom he calls simply Curtius Rufus, in accordance with his usual treatment of nomenclature. Decency forbids Tacitus to reveal the truth about this person's origin. He does not mind mentioning the story that Curtius Rufus was the son of a gladiator (that is, presumably, a condemned criminal or barbarian prisoner-of-war). The truth was more unspeakable than that! After adolescence Curtius was found as an attendant of the quaestor assigned to the province of Africa, and at Hadrumetum he received a vision (also recounted by Pliny *Ep.* VII, 27) which encouraged him to go to Rome and stand for political office. He was duly elected quaestor, thanks to the wealth of his friends and his own drive and ability. Subsequently he obtained the praetorship as *candidatus Caesaris*, the Caesar being Tiberius. He had a long old age after this, but in 48 as consular legate of Upper Germany he was awarded triumphal insignia by Claudius. He may have been the Rufus who is cited by Josephus as consul (suffect) with Pompeius Silvanus in 45.²⁴ Finally, he obtained the high honour of the African proconsulship, and there in Africa he died, all as foretold by his vision. The date was probably about the end

of Claudius' reign, possibly A.D. 53. For Statilius Taurus, one of the *consules ordinarii* of 45, held the proconsulship in 52/3, and Pompeius Silvanus, the colleague of 'Rufus', in 53/4.²⁵ Silvanus may have stepped into the vacancy created by Curtius Rufus' death, which appears from Pliny to have occurred soon after his arrival in the province. In that case, *longa post haec senectia* implies a date of birth hardly later than 10 B.C. It certainly implies a long gap between the praetorship and the consulship, which evidently came late to Curtius, when his brilliant early career had seemingly come to a standstill. The career may be very tentatively sketched as follows:²⁶ born c. 10 B.C.; quaestor c. A.D. 15; praetor c. 20/25; consul suffect c. 45; legate of Upper Germany c. 46-48; proconsul of Africa, and dies c. 53.

It is an economical hypothesis that the rhetorician Q. Curtius Rufus and the self-made man Curtius Rufus were one and the same person. *Nihil obstat*, and the dates fit. The elder Junius Gallio provides another contemporary example of a senatorial rhetor.²⁷ Tacitus' peculiar language about Curtius Rufus' origin strongly suggests servile birth.²⁸ How, unless by his brilliant natural gifts, he acquired the friends, whose bounty helped to start him on his political career, cannot be answered. For advancement he will certainly have had to cultivate Sejanus, like everyone else, as Terentius pointed out, though his *tristis adulatio* was apparently conspicuous. Thus Terentius' defence, which he will have heard in the Senate in A.D. 32, must have touched him closely. His account of the fall of Philotas probably carries more echoes from the Sejanus affair than we can now detect. The fall of Sejanus no doubt put a stop to Curtius' political career.²⁹ And in the following period it is reasonable to locate his activity as a rhetor. His late emergence in this rôle is suggested by the failure of the elder Seneca to mention him.

I believe, then, that there are sufficient indications that the author of the *Historiæ Alexandri* was Tacitus' Curtius Rufus. Tacitus' character for the man—*acri ingenio* and *adversus superiores tristi adulatione, adrogans minoribus, inter pares difficilis*—suits well the brilliant, cynical and acidulous manner of this highly gifted writer. That he was also numbered among prominent rhetoricians by Suetonius is in complete harmony with the nature of the *Historiæ*.²⁹ It has been objected to the identification that our author shows little grasp of military matters in his descriptions of battle-scenes. This, however, has been said of most Roman historians, including some who had commanded legions. The chief reason was the predominant emphasis on the literary and rhetorical quality of

such pieces. In any case it seems to be overlooked that Curtius Rufus was awarded his triumphal insignia for putting his legions usefully to work quarrying silver mines! As Syme has said, 'to govern an imperial province did not always demand the training or habits of the military'.³⁰ Again, it has been suggested that Curtius Rufus' vision at Hadrumetum is inconsistent with the hostility to magic and superstition displayed by the historian. But another, not very credulous historian, Tacitus, can represent the vision as a fact. And the experience seems entirely consonant with the writer's belief in a man's personal Fortune as a kind of guardian angel.³¹ Finally, Tacitus fails to mention that Curtius Rufus was an author. Nor, however, does he see always fit to allude to the literary efforts of other historical personages. These things were not relevant, in Tacitus' austere estimate. But we can see that there may well have been a connection between the revival of Curtius Rufus' career and the judicious piece of adulation he hastened to address to the new Emperor, himself a scholar and an historian.³²

NOTES

¹ The latest contribution is a dissertation by D. Korzeniewski, *Die Zeit des Quintus Curtius Rufus* (Cologne, 1959), which I have not seen. His arguments are partly summarized, partly quoted, by R. T. Bruère reviewing in *C.Ph.* LV 1960 266 ff. Korzeniewski supports W. W. Tarn on an Augustan date (see Tarn's discussion in *Alexander the Great* (1948) II, 91 ff.), but does not seem to have added anything of value. He makes the fundamental mistake of ignoring the fact that Curtius X, 9, 2 refers only to the Macedonian Empire, and does not entail exact parallels with the Roman situation. A point added by Bruère himself—a correspondence between Livy's *Praefatio* 5 and Curtius X, 9, 7—shows no more than that Curtius had studied Livy: which nobody doubts.

² VI, 2, 12. The other passages are V, 7, 9 and V, 8, 1.

³ I give the standard text, ignoring the unwarranted emendations *collisere vires* and *capiebat <capitibus>* in section 2.

⁴ *op. cit.*, II, 112. He tries to help his case by mistranslating *trepidarent* as 'were tottering'.

⁵ Tacitus *Hist.* II, 74, 79. The reference to Tyre in Curtius IV, 4, 21 (*multis ergo casibus defuncta et post excidium renata nunc tandem longa pace cuncta refovente sub tutela Romanae mansuetudinis acquiescit*) is not decisive, though it puts a strain on the Vespasianic hypothesis in view of the Jewish War which had recently raged near Tyre. If, as seems probable, the *longa pax* is the Roman peace (cf. R. Syme, *Tacitus* (1958) I, 218 (n.6)), an Augustan date would be unlikely; but it could conceivably mean the long peace enjoyed by Tyre itself.

⁶ There is a direct echo of Livy VI, 17, 4, *non observatam esse memoriam noctis illius quae paene ultima atque aeterna nomini Romano fuerit, refer-*

ring to the night when the Capitol was barely saved from the Gauls by the sacred geese and M. Manlius. The gist of Curtius' expression is 'we had a very narrow escape', which fits Claudius better than Augustus or Vespasian.

⁷ The accounts of these events are in Josephus *A.J.* XIX, 212 ff., Suetonius *Gai.* 58 ff., *Claud.* 10, and Dio LIX, 30, LX, 1 ff.

⁸ *I.L.S.* 212.

⁹ Cf. Schanz-Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*⁴, II (1935) 596 ff.

¹⁰ *op. cit.*, II, 112.

¹¹ This interpretation, of course, makes the view that Curtius wrote under Augustus even more untenable, especially as it becomes virtually impossible for Curtius to have read and studied Livy—as he so obviously had.

¹² *op. cit.*, II, 91.

¹³ Suetonius *Gai.* 52.

¹⁴ Cf. J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *The Emperor Gaius* (1934), 212 ff.

¹⁵ See Tarn, *op. cit.*, II, 96 ff.

¹⁶ Cf. Tarn, *op. cit.*, II, 100 and 113. Tarn leaves the crux unsolved, after offering and withdrawing an injudicious hypothesis about the Severi.

¹⁷ Pap. Lond. 1912 (M. P. Charlesworth, *Documents . . . Claudius and Nero* (1939), Part I, no. 2).

¹⁸ Suetonius *Aug.* 18.

¹⁹ Val. Max IV, 7 ext. 2.

²⁰ Curtius VII, 1, 26 ff. and Tacitus *Ann.* VI, 8, Dio LVIII, 19, 3 ff. The coincidence was first observed by Lipsius (according to Schanz-Hosius, *op. cit.*, II, 597).

²¹ The rest are L. Statius Ursulus (*flor.* A.D. 56), P. Clodius Quirinalis (A.D. 47), M. Antonius Liberalis (A.D. 48), Sex. Iulius Gabinianus (A.D. 76), M. Fabius Quintilianus (c. A.D. 30-96), Iulius Tiro. See Schanz-Hosius, *op. cit.*, II, 743 ff.

²² Cf. Schanz-Hosius, *op. cit.*, II, 352 and 347 f.

²³ Tacitus *Ann.* XV, 71.

²⁴ Josephus *A.J.* XX, 14. Cf. *R.E.* IV, 2 col. 1870. Degrassi (*I Fasti Consolari dell' Impero Romano*) refrains from committing himself to this identification, which is speculative. But he puts Curtius Rufus about this date,—somewhere in the years preceding 46. Syme (*Tacitus* (1958) II, 563 n. 6) opts for c. 43. Curtius was followed in Upper Germany by Pomponius Secundus, suffect consul of 44. But there is nothing to prevent Curtius' having been promoted ahead of Pomponius. Agricola's career is one example of promotion to consular legate immediately after the consulship, and the grant of triumphal insignia in itself suggests Curtius enjoyed the Emperor's especial favour.

²⁵ Tacitus *Ann.* XII, 59; *Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania* 338.

²⁶ Cf. Syme, *op. cit.*, II, 652 ff., on the senatorial career.

²⁷ Cf. Schanz-Hosius, *op. cit.*, II, 349 f.

²⁸ And that descendants were living? Compare perhaps, in the Antonine period, C. Curtius Rufinus (*R.E.* IV, 2, Curtius, no. 29—cf. 18, 19).

²⁹ Syme, *op. cit.*, II, 563 n. 6, accepts the triple identification.

³⁰ *op. cit.*, I, 71.

Curtius Rufus and the 'Historiae Alexandri'

³¹ Cf. Tarn, *op. cit.*, II, 95.

³² It may be useful to put together in one place the details of the life of Q. Curtius Rufus on the basis of what has been worked out above.

Born about 10 B.C., possibly a slave and, if so, manumitted in youth, he managed to acquire an excellent education. He gained a post on the administrative staff of the quaestor in Africa late in Augustus' reign. Returning to Rome, where his conspicuous ability brought him useful friendships with influential people, he secured election to the quaestorship about A.D. 15, thus gaining entry to the Senate. His *cursus* must have included an aedileship or tribunate of the plebs about A.D. 18. About A.D. 21, or a little later, he was recommended for the praetorship by the Emperor Tiberius, probably thanks to the influence of Sejanus. If all had gone well, he would have been in line for the consulship from about A.D. 33. But Sejanus' downfall put an end to his prospects. Frustrated in his political ambitions, he proceeded to turn his natural talents to advantage by practising as a declaimer and teacher of rhetoric. He shared the indignation of his fellow-members of the senatorial order at the conduct of the Emperor Gaius, and hit on the idea of writing a history of Alexander the Great, which, apart from its intrinsic interest and suitability for the display of his erudition and rhetorical genius, would provide the opportunity for covert propaganda against the reigning Emperor. At Gaius' death the work was close to completion. Curtius was quick to adjust to the new situation, and introduced passages designed to ingratiate him with the new Emperor. He was rewarded with high marks of favour by Claudius (a fellow-admirer of Livy), and was able to resume his political career, attaining the consulship in approximately his 55th year, and immediately afterwards the important post of imperial legate of Upper Germany. Military operations were not called for; his opposite number in Lower Germany, Domitius Corbulo, was rebuked by Claudius for attempting them. But Curtius was able to please the Emperor by using his troops to work silver-mines in the territory of the Mattiaci. For this he was rewarded with triumphal insignia in A.D. 48. About five years later his career received its crowning glory when he was appointed to the proconsulship of Africa. But soon after taking up the province, he fell ill and died.

HESIOD AND THE ODYSSEY

L. G. POCKOCK

ON the basis of my findings about the *Odyssey* published in *The Sicilian Origin of the Odyssey* (1957)¹, *Reality and Allegory in the Odyssey* (1959)², and a *Note on ἀντίοποιον Ὀκεανοῖο* in *Hermes* of July 1960, I would now argue that the poet of our *Odyssey* knew and made use of a number of passages to be found in the Hesiodic poems—the *Works and Days*, that is to say, the *Theogony*, and some at any rate of the *Catalogues* and *Eoiae*—whereas in the Hesiodic poems there appears to be no knowledge whatsoever of our *Odyssey*. It will follow naturally that these Hesiodic poems are earlier than our *Odyssey*—the poet of which, as will appear, looked upon them as one man's work: and it can in consequence be shown that their author was familiar with earlier, and in some respects quite different, legends concerning Odysseus's adventures in the Western Mediterranean—legends which had been handed down (as Strabo suggests in iii. 2. 12-13) from Mycenaean times, with clear traces of a once remarkably realistic knowledge of those regions.

A summary of modern views on the main Hesiodic problems will be found in *Hesiod and Aeschylus*. Solmsen, (Cornell University Press 1949) pp. 3, 4, 5, 6, at foot. 'Throughout these chapters,' says Professor Solmsen on p. 4 'I have treated the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days* as poems of the same man, not of the same school.' In this I feel sure that he is justified. 'A careful study of the relations between Hesiod and the *Odyssey*,' he continues on p. 6 'has been made by Inez Sellschopp (*Stilistische Untersuchungen zu Hesiod*, Diss. Hamburg 1934) whose observations suggest that large sections of the *Odyssey*, especially Bks. i-iv, v-viii and the whole second half of the epos as we have it, were unknown to Hesiod. . . .' With these conclusions I would agree but would add Bks. ix-xiii to Miss Sellschopp's list. I would also express my very great admiration for M. H. A. L. H. van der Valk's *Textual Criticism of the Odyssey* (Leiden, 1949). I am happy to find myself, with a quite different approach, always convinced by his briefly stated judgments on Hesiod's priority of date, his authorship of the *Theogony* as well as the *Works and Days*, and the use or adaptation of various passages in them by the poet of the *Odyssey*.³ My arguments, however, unlike his and Professor Solmsen's (to which they will be supplementary) are largely topographical in nature and new in consequence. I should make it quite clear that they rest, ultimately, upon the topographical findings presented in my *RAO*; and that I

am now proceeding upon the hypothesis or assumption that those findings are in general correct and exclusive in consequence of others that have been from time to time suggested.

Whether the remains of the *Catalogues* and *Eoiae* that have come down to us, are fragments also of the authentic work of Hesiod, must remain a matter of opinion. My opinion is that some of them certainly are. I refer particularly to those that involve points of topography which tally with the topography of the *Odyssey*, and which, according to my findings, may similarly be described as pre-scholastic. Numbers 45, 46, 47, 48, for example (in Evelyn-White's enumeration), are of interest in connexion with the Planctae and the isles of Circe, the Sirens, and Calypso respectively. The contents of these passages appear to have been used by the poet of the *Odyssey* in the same spirit as a number of passages in the *Theogony*, and will be mentioned or discussed below.

The identifications of the fictitiously named places in the *Odyssey*, as published in *RAO*, had been arrived at strictly from the internal evidence of the *Odyssey* itself, without any reference to Hesiod—on the principle of one thing at a time. I now find that this was a mistake, so far as the completeness of my *RAO* was concerned—or indeed of my article in *Hermes*. I do not however greatly regret it. Apart from other considerations it must, I think, give an independent value both to my previous arguments and to those of my present topic—the light, that is to say, which a new topographical understanding of the *Odyssey* sheds on Hesiod, and *vice versa*. It now becomes evident that the poet of our *Odyssey* is far more heavily indebted to Hesiod than had been realized by anyone: and that Hesiod, as well as the poet of the *Odyssey*, owes the better part of his inspiration far more definitely to the western half of the Mediterranean than the eastern, and to the Straits of Gibraltar in particular. There, in both poets, and not in the outer sea, is the abode of 'Ocean', and thence his waters flow—in various directions. There the Argonauts are said to have passed⁴: and there the scenes of the last three labours of Hercules are to be located within real and restricted geographical limits. There the House of Styx and the House of Hades, one above the other, both in Hesiod and in the *Iliad*, are to be pin-pointed with exactitude—a fact of which neither poet is likely to have been aware: and there was the meeting place of Mycenaean Greeks and Phoenicians, and their myths and deities, since before the beginning of the last millennium before our era. The geographical interest in the old Greek epic shifts to the western seas.

¶1 Taking the 15 landfalls of Odysseus in sequence after leaving

Troy, we find that Hesiod makes no mention of the Cicones; the Lotus Eaters; Polyphemus⁵; Aeolus as Steward of the Winds⁶; Telepylos or the high city of Lamos⁷; Aeaea as the name of Circe's Island⁸; the city of the Cimmerians and the Rivers of Hades⁹ or Odysseus's visit to the Dead; the Sirens of the *Odyssey*¹⁰; the Planctae¹¹; Charybdis¹²; the Scylla of the *Odyssey*¹³; the Thrinacian Isle¹⁴; Atlas as father of Calypso¹⁵; Scheria and the land of the Phaeacians¹⁶; the return to Ithaca¹⁷; the wooing of Penelope, the slaying of the suitors, the harbour Rheithron, the harbour of Phorcys, Mt. Neion or Neriton, the Hill of Hermes, Asteris, the Swift Isles, Dulichium, Same, Zacynthos etc. etc.

It may be said, with truth, that the Hesiodic poems are fragmentary, and that some of these omissions may be accidental. From those instances, however, in which Hesiod does mention characters and places with which we are familiar in the *Odyssey* it will be seen that his tales of Odysseus in the west must in many respects have been quite different from our own.

¶2 Following the episodes in the *Odyssey*, and using a good index to the poems of Hesiod,¹⁸ we find, at the first point of contact between the two, that the Cyclopes mentioned by Hesiod are not by him connected in any way with Odysseus. They are three in number. Their names are Brontes, Steropes, and Arges. They provided Zeus with his thunder and his thunder-bolts; 'strength and might and craft were in their works' (*Theogony* 139 ff.). They were, in short, primitive, mythical, smiths and craftsmen, very different from the essentially pastoral Giants of the *Odyssey*, the kinsmen and neighbours of the Phaeacians. They have, however, each a single, centrally situated eye, such as might perhaps have been suggested by the open door of a furnace; and they are Giants—being sons of Earth. Hesiod then, we may assume, had never heard of our Odyssean Cyclopes. But the poet of our *Odyssey*, it will appear, had heard of Hesiod's Cyclopes; and has used them as he has used other characters in Hesiod, or in older sources from which Hesiod drew, for his own purposes and in his own characteristic manner.

It has been argued in *RAO* that all the landfalls of Odysseus in our *Odyssey* are real places under fictitious names, so that in every case their allegorical names have either to be invented or borrowed for them from elsewhere. It was Samuel Butler's hypothesis, propounded 65 years ago, and haughtily disregarded ever since—an hypothesis however that will never fail to justify itself, if put seriously to the test—that the 'Phaeacians' in the *Odyssey* represent a Greek-speaking community of the Elymi of Western Sicily—the 'Phocians from Troy', in fact, of Thucydides vi. 2¹⁹; whilst the

Giant 'Cyclopes' and 'Laestrygonians' represent communities of their Sican neighbours; who—as Thucydides tells us—claimed to be 'autochthonous' and so might be referred to as Sons of Earth or Giants. Our poet then has used the *name* of Hesiod's Earth-born Cyclopes in order to lampoon these 'earth-born' Sican neighbours of the immigrant Greek-speaking Elymi of ancient Trapani.

Besides borrowing the name, it is to be noted, he lets it be assumed, more or less—and for more reasons than one very probably²⁰—that Polyphemus also has the single centrally situated eye of Hesiod's Cyclopes. But he will not commit himself to an absurdity of that type. This, I assert, is a form of humour, to be found elsewhere in the poem, in which he plays something of a trick upon the minds of his audience. So in xii. 69 ff. he brings the ship *Argo* to the *Planctae*, arouses our expectations, and then leaves us, or most of us, feeling somewhat puzzled, to realize that the *Planctae* have nothing to do with the *Symplegades* after all. Similarly in xiii 113 the reader finds to his surprise that the Phaeacian sailors were already familiar with the harbour of Phorcys in 'Ithaca' to which the magic ship has brought *Odysseus* fast asleep: strangely enough they had been there before. This type of humour, it will be understood, would be best appreciated by the inner circle of the poet's audience who knew his ways and his topography.²¹

¶3 (1) At the second point of contact, the name of 'Aeolus' appears to have been borrowed by our poet from Hesiod (on even slenderer grounds) for his Steward of the Winds—a character of whom Hesiod says nothing. The name *Αἰολος* would be suitable in itself, no doubt, for the changeful nature of the winds, the shifting vapour-clouds above Stromboli, and the bright lights of its frequent eruptions²². In Hesiod. *Catalogues* 4 in Evelyn-White, an Aeolus *Hippiocharmes* is mentioned as one of the sons of Hellen, and father himself of Cretheus, Salmoneus, and Sisyphus, who, along with some 25 or 30 other Hesiodic heroes and heroines, most of whom are but names to us—and to our poet also, I imagine—have been used to fill up space and entertain the audience in the *Nekyia* of the *Odyssey*. Our poet, besides borrowing the name of Aeolus from Hesiod (or possibly of course from some one else) has also used its Hesiodic epithet of *Hippiocharmes*, which however he has transferred to one called *Amythaon*²³ (who is also another Hesiodic hero—see *Catalogues* 13), whilst coining on the analogy of *Hippiocharmes* the name of *Hippotades* for his Aeolus—or so it seems.

It will appear that it is purely by our poet's whim, and by a curiously tenuous thread that the Lipari Islands acquired the alternative

name of the Aeolian Islands by which they have since been generally known.

(2) There appears to be one reference only in Hesiod to the Laestrygonians, which is, however, whether genuinely Hesiodic or not, of considerable interest. In *Ox. Pap.* 1358. fr. 2 (see White p. 604), lines 25-7 have been restored to read as follows: . . . κ[αὶ Αἴτυν]ην παιπαλόεσσαν, νῆσον ἐπ' Ὀρτυγίην, Λαιστ[ρυγον]ίην τε γενέθλην, ὃς τε Ποσειδάωνος ἐρυσθεν[έ]ος γένεθ' υἱός—'the people sprung from Laestrygon, the son of almighty Poseidon.' (See also ¶ 10 below). In the *Odyssey* the kinship of the Laestrygonians to Poseidon is a matter of importance in my argument. In my *RAO* it has been deduced throughout from the fact that like Polyphemus and the Cyclopes, who were sons of Poseidon, they also were 'Giants' (cf. *Od.* vii. 205-6). It is satisfactory therefore to have this corroboration, which suggests also, be it noted, the Sicilian habitat of the Laestrygonians, in agreement with Thucydides vi. 2. For good evidence in the Laestrygonian episode that our poet was familiar with the *Theogony* see ¶ 9 below.

¶4 The matter of Circe, as she appears in Hesiod, her island in the western seas and her relationship to Ocean and the Sun, is of the greatest interest and importance. It is closely connected with the visit to the House of Hades in the *Odyssey*, and thereby also with Calypso and the island of Ogygia. These three episodes therefore are best taken together for the purposes of the present discussion.

The names of Circe and Aeetes, once again, are taken by our poet, it will appear, directly from Hesiod. In *Od.* x. 135 ff. Circe, we are told, is full sister to Aeetes, both of them being begotten of the Sun, their mother being Perse or Perses, the daughter of Ocean. In the *Theogony*, 956 ff., Perseis daughter of Ocean is their mother, their sire is the Sun (the same epithet, φαεσίμβροτος, being used for the Sun in either case). Aeetes, furthermore, in the *Theogony* weds yet another daughter of Ocean (not mentioned in the *Odyssey*) and by her begets Medea, grand-daughter of the Sun.

It has been shown in *SOO* and *RAO* that the Gates of the setting Sun of *Od.* xxiv. 12 are the western Pillars of Baal-Hercules, who, by the Phoenicians, was worshipped also as a solar deity; that Odysseus sacrificed at the place of sunset to the spirits of Hades and the dream folk of the Dead,²⁴ at the White Point of xxiv. 11, in the narrows of the Straits of Gibraltar, some three miles' walk beyond the site of modern Ceuta and the Gateway of the Sun. It will be found also that both in the *Odyssey* and in Hesiod the River of Ocean means, primarily, the *swift*²⁵ east-going Portugal or Atlantic

current flowing from the Straits of Gibraltar, not his circumambient streams that flow around the earth. These 'daughters of Ocean' then (and others also, as will be seen) are by their parentage connected with the Straits, where Ocean and Mother Tethys dwelt²⁶; and the Straits in their turn are connected with Helios, sire of Circe and Aeetes, as lying themselves beneath the Gateway of the Setting Sun.

In this matter it will become I think abundantly clear that the poet of the *Odyssey* has made use of material to be found in Hesiod, whereas Hesiod shows no knowledge of our *Odyssey*.

Hesiod is said to have called Circe's island Hesperia (see below). Our poet calls it Aeaea, partly no doubt from the name of Aeetes, taken from Hesiod, partly perhaps for other reasons also.²⁷ It has been argued in *RAO* (Chs. III and VIII) that he has used for his Aeaea the isle of Ustica or Osteodes, the most 'distant' or westerly of all the Aeolian Islands (with which, geographically, it is to be included). But he has got the idea of this western isle of Circe, an island distant from all others, facing the Tyrrhenian Sea (Ustica in fact, as will appear) in the first place from Hesiod.

In the *Theogony* 1011 ff. we read that Circe, daughter of Helios 'in love for long-suffering Odysseus, bore Agrius and Latinus . . . who far away in the most distant corner of the holy islands (τῆλε μυχῷ νήσων ἱερᾶων) ruled over all the noble Tyrsenians'. This I feel sure must mean the Aeolian Islands, from Vulcano or *Hiera*, the Holy Island, and Lipari itself, the 'smithy of the Gods', by way of Salina, Filicudi, and Alicudi (one of which *must* be the island of the Sirens both in Hesiod and the *Odyssey*) to Ustica, which faces the Tyrrhenian Sea at their 'most distant corner'. We know from *Arg.* iv. 919, that Apollonius following Hesiod (*Cat.* 47) placed the Sirens' island amongst the Aeolian Isles, not far from the 'Lily-baeian height' of Mt. Eryx—and we read in the Scholiast on *Arg.* iii. 311, (see *Cat.* 46) that, 'following Hesiod, Apollonius makes Circe come on the chariot of the Sun to the island over against Tyrrhenia, calling it Hesperia since it lies toward the sunset'. 'Hesperia' in Hesiod, then, will not mean Italy or any island on its coast, whatever Apollonius may have thought. In Hesiod, in any case, we have an entirely different tale of Odysseus's adventures in the west, a tale earlier than that of the *Odyssey*, inasmuch as the poet knows and uses his Hesiod, and Hesiod does not know the poet. It connects Odysseus not only with the Straits of Gibraltar, but also with Italy, it would seem, of which there is not a single hint in our *Odyssey*. Agrius and Latinus (with their curious overtones), and the Tyrrhenians, and Circe's chariot of the Sun, are quite foreign to the tale of the *Odyssey* as we know it.

Our poet however will without doubt have had that Hesiodic

'chariot of the Sun' in mind, when he puzzled posterity by telling us at the beginning of Bk. xii that in Circe's western island (see *RAO* p. 47) are the Temple and the Dancing Grounds of Early Dawn and the Risings of the Sun. The explanation is, I believe, that just as the setting Sun was worshipped in the Phoenician-held Straits of Gibraltar, the rising Sun was worshipped on the eastward-facing slopes of the Phoenician-held island of Ustica, Baal-Hercules being worshipped also as a solar deity.

It is then a fair presumption, to sum this section up, that Ustica or Osteodes, as in the *Odyssey*, so also in Hesiod, will be Circe's island, the most distant corner of the Holy Isles.²⁸

¶5 That our poet has used material from elsewhere for a number of his episodes is of course no slur on his originality or creative genius. Apart from his own remarkable inventiveness he gives a new life and freshness to everything he touches. In *RAO* it has been argued that, as a seaman of the Elymi, under Phoenician suzerainty, he knew personally all the topography he describes between Syracuse, the Lipari Islands and the Straits, Hesiod's knowledge of western waters will presumably not have been acquired at first hand,²⁹ but it is none the less extremely interesting. As with the *Iliad*, it must be derived from very early sources.

In *Od.* x. 487 ff. Circe (on Aeaëa-Ustica) tells Odysseus he must go to the House of Hades. When he asks her, in 501, who will show him the way, she replies, in effect, with admirable accuracy: 'The breath of Boreas' (i.e. the N.E. Wind, *El Greco*).³⁰ 'Step your mast, spread your sails, and you *cannot go wrong*' (506-7, cf. xi. 10). 'When you have passed through Ocean'³¹ (i.e. up-stream past Tunisia to the Pillars of Hercules) 'and reached a low-lying shore'³² and the groves of Persephone, beach your ship *by deep-eddying Ocean*. . . ' (511—the same epithet being used of Ocean in *Theog.* 133 and *W. and D.* 171). So too in xi. 155 ff. Anticleia says to Odysseus ' . . . hard it is for the living to see these abodes. For between us are great rivers and dread currents, *Ocean first of all*, through which you cannot pass . . . save in a well-built ship.'

So in *Theogony* 215, 275 and 518 we read of the Hesperides guarding their golden fruits '*beyond glorious Ocean* (cf. Servius on *Aen.* iv. 484: '*Hesiodus has Hesperidas Noctis filias ultra Oceanum mala aurea habuisse dicir*'): in 270-274 we are told of others also living there; and in 292 ff. of Heracles *passing through the Strait of Ocean* (πόρον Ὠκεανοῖο) and killing Orthus and Eurytion in the murky stables of Geryon '*beyond glorious Ocean*'.³³ This means of course the waters of the Straits, not the circumambient streams of Ocean.

Having reached the Limits of Ocean³⁴ Odysseus and his men walk

on to the place of sacrifice at Pta. Blanca, the Λευκάς πέτρῃ of xxiv. 11, the *album promunturium* of Pliny *N.H.* iii, where 'Pyriphlegethon' and 'Cocytus' flow into 'Acheron' (*Od.* x. 513-4). These names have been bestowed by our poet on the tidal currents in the Straits, which, flowing at the rate of 3 knots or more, alter direction with the tides, forming 'violent races off many of the prominent points and eddies in some of the bays, including that of Ceuta'.³⁵ These rivers of Hades occur first in the *Odyssey*. They are not mentioned in Hesiod or in the *Iliad*. Styx is mentioned, but is never called a river.

¶6 (1) In *Iliad* viii. 366 ff. Athena, in an angry moment, is made to say that had she known how Zeus was going to treat her, his dear son Heracles, when sent to the House of Hades, the 'Warden of the Gates', to fetch the hound Cerberus up from Erebus, so far as she was concerned 'would never have escaped from the sheer' (or 'steep' or 'lofty') 'stream of the Water of Styx' . . . οὐκ ἂν ὑπεξέφυγε Στυγὸς ὕδατος αἰπὰ ῥέεθρα. Styx then, it will appear, is not a river, but a waterfall of some sort, at, or above, the actual entrance to the House of Hades and the realms of Tartarus; which, as in the *Odyssey*, so also without doubt in the *Iliad* and in Hesiod will be somewhere in the Straits of Gibraltar: (cf. Strabo iii. 2. 12-13; *RAO* Chs. VI and VIII).

(2) So too, in *Iliad* xv. 36-8 Hera speaks of 'the down-falling Water of Styx, which is the greatest and most terrible of oaths for the blessed gods' . . . ἴστω νῦν τόδε γαῖα καὶ οὐρανὸς εὐρὺς ὑπερθεῖν καὶ τὸ κατειβόμενον Στυγὸς ὕδωρ, ὅς τε μέγιστος ὄρκος δεινότατός τε πέλει μακάρεσσιν. (Exactly the same words are used from the *Iliad* and put into the mouth of Calypso by our poet in *Od.* v. 184 ff.)

(3) In Hesiod, *Theogony*, 361 ff., Styx is called 'the chief of all the daughters of Ocean' by Tethys, Goddess of the Sea. Wedded to Pallas (383) she is the mother of 'Zeal', 'Victory', 'Strength' and 'Might', a very powerful goddess, honoured for her aid in the battle against the Titans, brought in the first place to Olympus (397) and appointed by Zeus to be 'the great oath of the Gods' (400). In *Theogony* 736-806 however she is no longer on Olympus, but very definitely in the Straits of Gibraltar 'where are the beginnings and the ends of land and sea' (807 ff.), 'the eldest daughter of backward-flowing Ocean' (776), connected, as in the *Iliad*, with Hades, Erebus, Tartarus, Persephone, and Cerberus, and 'living apart from the gods in her glorious house, roofed over with long³⁶ rocks, propped up to heaven all round with silver pillars' (777-9).

'Not often does . . . Iris come over the sea's wide back' from Olympus to this distant place: but if strife arises amongst the gods,

Zeus sends her thither to fetch a draught of the holy water of Styx in a golden jug. 'the famous cold water which trickles from a high, precipitous rock' (782-6) ... ὅτ' ἐκ πέτρης καταλείβεται ἡλιβάτοιο ὑψηλῆς. So far Styx is certainly a waterfall—of fresh water it would seem.

(4) But from *Theogony* 787 onwards mythology apparently not in accordance with reality supervenes. 'Far beneath the earth' we are told, a *branch* or 'horn', of Ocean flows 'through the black night'. Nine parts of his silvery-swirling waters flow around the earth and the broad back of the sea and then fall into the salty deep. . . . 'The tenth part of them is the water of Styx' (surprisingly enough) 'which flows out from a rock, a great bane to the Gods' (789 and 792 . . . ἡ δὲ μὲν ἐκ πέτρης προρέει μέγα πῆμα θεοῖσιν). For any God who pours a libation of her water and then forswears himself is subject to distressing penalties detailed in 793-804. 'Such an oath then did the Gods appoint the water of Styx to be, her water immortal (ἄφθιτον) and (?) primeval (ῥύγιον); and it issues from a rocky place' (806—τὸ δ' ἔησι καταστυφέλον διὰ χώρον).

¶7 In spite of the apparently unrealistic nature of this tale of Styx and subterranean Ocean, it could still not be doubted that the water of Styx was in some way connected with a waterfall. As it could also not be doubted, by the present writer at least, that the Odyssean House of Hades was in the Straits of Gibraltar, not far from Ceuta, on the African coast; and that, as in the *Odyssey*, the House of Hades and the House of Styx in Hesiod—and in *Iliad* viii. 366 ff.—could not be far away, it was natural first to make inquiries as to whether there was anything in the nature of a waterfall in the neighbourhood of Pta. Blanca or Gibel Musa. It seemed possible also that the myth of subterranean Ocean might perhaps have been connected with the more saline Mediterranean current which flows outwards from the Straits, beneath the incoming Atlantic current. This in the first place was worth consideration in view of the passage in *Iliad* ii. 751-5 (Catalogue of Ships), where it is said that Titaesius (in the neighbourhood of Dodona) 'flows into Peneius; but not mixing with his silvery-swirling waters' (cf. *Theog.* 791) 'flows on top of Peneius like oil. For he is an offshoot of the Water of Styx, the dread water of the oath'. (The last four Greek words in this passage—Στυγὸς ὕδατος ἐστὶν ἀπορρώξ—are taken by our poet and used in *Od.* x. 514 of the river Cocytus, as will be mentioned again below). Strabo furthermore in i. 3. 7. speaks of the theory held by Strato and Eratosthenes that the Mediterranean was once a lake which finally broke out, and poured its waters through the Straits of Gibraltar, 'as over a waterfall' —ὡς ἐκ καταράκτου.

Hesiod and the 'Odyssey'

It soon became apparent, however, that these ideas, though interesting and important very probably as later mythical developments, were in fact unnecessarily far-fetched, and that the tales of Styx, the House of Hades, and even subterranean Ocean had a surprisingly factual or rational origin.

¶8 I am indebted to Mr Stuart Perry of the Wellington Public Library, New Zealand, for finding and at once realizing the significance of the following passage in *The Penny Cyclopaedia of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, London, 1838, Vol. II, s.v. Gibraltar*: 'The Rock consists principally of a gray compact marble. It abounds with caves, the most remarkable of which is St. Michael's on the south-west side. The entrance to this cave is 1,000 feet above the sea level and leads to a spacious hall apparently supported by massive stalactites. Beneath this is a succession of descending caves, beautifully picturesque but of difficult access. The impurity of the atmosphere has hitherto prevented their being explored to a greater depth than 500 feet below the entrance. But when the writer visited this spot a few months since he was assured by the person who attended him that at the above depth the waves of the Mediterranean might occasionally be heard beating into the caves below.'

Together with the evidence to be found in the *Odyssey* and the *Theogony*, taken in conjunction, this short passage (although, as will be seen from the Appendix, in some respects erroneous) threw a flood of light upon the Stygian darkness. Mr Perry had found the authentic House of Hades. St. Michael's Cave beyond doubt will be the glorious hall of Styx. In antiquity at any rate, some 400 feet or more beneath the summit of the Rock (1,396 feet) there will have been water falling, or trickling, from some high rocky point, perhaps increasing in volume from tributary sources in the caverns down below. These with their darkness and dankness will have suggested the descent by way of the Gates of Hades to the nethermost realms of Tartarus: while the imagined sound of the sea waves may well have suggested the horn of subterranean Ocean 'far beneath the earth in the blackness of night', one tenth of whose volume is said to have been provided by the descending waters of Styx.

The following may also be quoted from *Chambers' Encyclopaedia* Vol. 5, 1924: 'The rocky mass is perforated by numerous caverns . . . : the largest, called the Hall of St Michael, is 220 ft. long, 90 wide, and 70 high and *its floor is connected with the roof by stalactite pillars . . . linked by arches on the top . . .* (cf. *Theogony* 777-8 νόσφιν δὲ θεῶν κλυτὰ δώματα ναίει μακρῆσιν πέτρῃσι κατηρεφέ. ἀμφὶ δὲ πάντῃ κίοσιν ἀργυρέοισι πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἐστήρικται). For

the importance of this passage see also the Appendix. The word *μακρῆσιν* means literally *long*—not 'great', as usually rendered.

The matter of the waterfall only remains. Now that a large area on the upper surface of the Rock has been covered with concrete, for the collection of rainwater, it may well be that the course of the waterfall is not now to be identified. It may indeed have ceased to flow for centuries before Hesiod and Homer wrote. Ramsay and Geikie, however, on the *Geology of Gibraltar*, in the *Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society*, 1878, Vol. xxxiv, p. 520, speaking of those caves which descend at various angles, '*sometimes approaching verticality*', remark that there can be no question but that they '*owe their origin to underground waters*, their direction being determined by the joints and fissures and bedding planes of the limestone. . . . Such faults would tend to divert much of the drainage in one particular vertical direction'.³⁷ Hence no doubt the difficulties of exit alluded to in *Iliad* viii. 369. That the waterfall was there once upon a time is really not open to doubt. It may be remarked that severe climatic changes may well have occurred during the second millennium B.C., or even later, during which the rainfall may have been very much heavier.

Whether or not this identification of the 'Homeric' Hades has been previously proposed I do not know. Merry and Riddell on *Od.* v. 185 remark that the abode of Styx as described in the *Theogony* may have been suggested by 'the scenery of some stalactitic cave'. I find no mention in Pauly-Wissowa s.v. *Styx* of caves or stalactites or (more important) of the Straits of Gibraltar. But in *Gibraltar*, by José Plá. London, 1955, p. 137, it is noted as an instance of Napoleon's strategical acumen that he wrote this fine sentence: 'The Keys of Gibraltar are in London. Its Cerberus is the British Navy.' If this is merely a chance coincidence, it is a curious one. But if others have connected Hades and the Hall of St Michael, they have not been able to prove it. The proof comes by way of the *Odyssey*, the information that it gives and a little common sense applied to it.

¶9 The whole apparatus of the nether regions in Homer and Hesiod, then, though they probably did not know it themselves, was located in the caverns of the Rock of Gibraltar—the House of Styx on top, the House of Hades beneath it, and the abyss of Tartarus down below, all of it underground at the *πεύρατα γαίης*.

Of this the poet of the *Odyssey*, though he certainly knew the Straits and used his Homer and his Hesiod, was either unaware or for reasons of his own preferred not to use his knowledge. He

Hesiod and the 'Odyssey'

is in agreement with Hesiod that the river of 'Ocean' was the Atlantic current flowing eastward from the Straits. He takes Calypso and her island of Ogygia-Perejil straight from him, as will appear. But he gives a wide berth to Hesiod's details of Styx and 'subterranean ocean'. He sets his Field of Asphodel and House of Hades on the African coast, of which Homer and Hesiod show no knowledge, excepting in the matter of Atlas and the southern Pillar of Hercules. The tidal currents and races in the Straits have suggested to him the Rivers of Hades—Pyriphlegethon, Cocytus and Acheron—of which again they say nothing. Using the half line from *Iliad* ii. 755, as mentioned above (§ 7), and with Hesiod no doubt in mind, he calls Cocytus an 'offshoot of Styx'. As others have done, I had assumed that his Styx was yet another river. I see now that he is being non-committal in the matter—characteristically non-committal, I would say: (cf. § 2 above, *ad fin.*). In one matter however he has failed to be non-committal. It was quite in order for Hesiod (or his authority) when speaking of the dark, dank caverns in the bowels of the Rock (*Theogony* 759-761) to say: οὐδέ ποτ' αὐτοὺς Ἡέλιος φαέθων ἐπιδέρκεται ἀκτίνεσσιν οὐρανὸν εἰς ἀνῶν οὐδ' οὐρανόθεν καταβαίνων. But for our poet in xi. 13 ff. to repeat Hesiod's identical words (improving slightly on the second line) and to say that the sun *never* shone on the *folk and city of Ceuta*, was an exaggeration, which, however humorously it may have been intended, has contributed to the age-old confusion in Odyssean scholarship. There are many other expressions or word-pictures in the *Theogony*, besides those already quoted in §§ 4 and 5 above, which have, or may have, influenced our poet in these scenes. For example, at the entrance to the realms of Tartarus—in the Rock of Gibraltar—there is said to be a 'threshold of bronze immovable' (*Theogony* 811-12): there is also a 'wall of bronze' round Tartarus (726, 733). These words in Hesiod may well have helped to suggest the 'wall of bronze unbreakable' round Aeolus's rocky isle of Stromboli in *Od.* x. 3-4. There are "shining gates" at Tartarus (811), which, though different from the Gates of *Od.* xxiv. 12, may yet be verbally connected with them. It is fascinating to find in Hesiod, with certainty, the provenance and elucidation of that much disputed line, *Od.* x. 86: 'For close to one another are the paths of night and day.'³⁸

In that Laestrygonian context (see *RAO* Ch. IV) the 'journeying of the night' refers to the cow-herd's trip, who takes his cattle out to pasture for the night and brings them in again for the day-time; while the 'journeying of the day' refers to the shepherd, who brings his sheep home in the evening, and takes them out again at early

dawn to pasture in the daytime—so that, at the approach to the township, shepherd and cowman meet and hail one another as they pass (82-3).

The Straits of Gibraltar are the place of sunset and darkness, sleep and death (*Theogony* 759 ff.), the Limits of Land and Ocean (736 ff.), the dread House of Hades and the abode of Night (744 ff.). Here—on Gibel Musa—stands the son of Iapetus, holding up the wide heaven on his hands and head (746-7). *Here at the Rock of Gibraltar Night and Day coming close to one another* (748 ff.) *greet one another as they pass, the one going into the House of Hades, over the brazen threshold, and the other coming out:*—a fine and imaginative passage, as indeed is its continuation down to line 814.

Our poet has taken it, reduced³⁹ it to scale, and used it characteristically for his own more ordinary but not less imaginative word-picture—appealing as it does simultaneously to the senses of sight, sound, and smell. “Laestrygonia” has nothing whatever to do with Scandinavian fjords or Swiss yodellers or the midnight sun: it is essentially Sicilian.⁴⁰

The foregoing seems to be particularly good argument that our poet knew and used his Hesiod: it may be noted that even the ‘great threshold of bronze’ in *Theogony* 749-50 reminds us at least of the great οὐδός of stone⁴¹ in *Od.* xx. 258, xxii. 2, xxiii. 88. The matter of Calypso and Ogygia however is of more immediate importance.

¶10 Calypso in *Theogony* 359 is a sister of Styx, one of the many daughters of Ocean and Tethys (cf. also *Hymn to Demeter*, 422). She makes a dramatic appearance in *Ox. Pap.* 1358 fr. 2, a portion of which has been quoted at the end of ¶3 above: The sons of Boreas pursue the Harpies all over the known world, in Scythia, Africa, and Italy, in eastern Sicily, and back to the Ionian Islands. Lines 30, 30a, 31, are restored to read as follows: . . . ἐς τε Κεφαλλ] ἡνων ἀγέρωχων φῦλον ὄρουσαν, [δῆμον Ὀδυσσῆος ταλασίφρονος, ὃν μετέπειτα] εἶργε Ποσει] δάωνι Καλύψω πότνια νύμφη. On the strength of this, if it is genuine, it would appear that our poet has taken not only Circe and Ustica, but Calypso, and Ogygia also, together with the wrath of Poseidon, remarkably enough, from the pages of Hesiod. These, if they are indeed from Hesiod, *must* be earlier tales of Odysseus in the west. It is incredible that any serious post-Odyssean version should have made Circe, in Ustica, the mother by Odysseus of Agrius and Latinus,⁴² and Calypso the mother of Nausinous and Nausithous (*Theogony* 1011-1018): and I think I may say that it

has already been shown above and by other scholars (pp. 1, 2) that the Hesiodic poems or what survives of them are earlier than the *Odyssey*. It has been argued in my *RAO* that with our Odyssean tale of Odysseus's detention on the island of Ogygia in particular the real experiences of a 7th century hero of the Elymi may be interwoven. This would not preclude the possibility (which now proves indeed to be a very strong possibility) that Perejil might also have figured in an earlier tale concerning the Homeric hero of Mycenaean times. History might perfectly well have thus repeated itself: and without being dogmatic one way or the other I would certainly not abandon my hypothesis of the 7th century hero.⁴³

It has also been argued *passim* in *RAO* that our West Sicilian seaman-poet is personally familiar with all his scenery. That I am sure is correct. So here, it seems, instead of following Hesiod in calling Calypso a daughter of Ocean, he has in his independent way made her, more interestingly and more graphically, the daughter of Atlas, who holds Heaven and Earth asunder. (*Od.* i. 51 ff.). His description of Ogygia is far more detailed and realistic than is Hesiod's.

¶11. Whether or not the four springs outside Calypso's cave are still running⁴⁴ (they may very well have dried up in two and a half thousand years), it has been shown elsewhere beyond reasonable doubt, that Bérard's sixty years old identification of Perejil Island as 'Ogygia' was right, from the evidence of the *Odyssey* alone. Unless there is another suitable island situated in the Straits of Gibraltar, the accumulation of indications to be found in Hesiod proves that identification finally:

(1) According to Hesiod Calypso is the daughter of Ocean and Tethys. This connects her *prima facie* with the Straits of Gibraltar,⁴⁵ as it connects her sister Styx.

(2) The poet of the *Odyssey* has preferred to call her the daughter of Atlas, inasmuch, it will appear, as the island of Perejil-Ogygia lies at the foot of Gibel Musa, the most northerly summit of the Atlas Range. In the *Theogony* 517 ff. Atlas, supporting Heaven and Earth upon his head and shoulders, stands *πέραςιν ἐν γαίης* (i.e. at the threshold of the Straits), *πρόπαρ Ἑσπερίδων λυγυφώνων* (i.e. facing the Hesperides, whose garden lies beyond it; see ¶5 above). The scholiast on *Od.* i. 85 (*cf.* *Cat.* 48) has the following: 'Hesiod says that *Ogygia* lies inside towards the west' (*ἐντὸς . . . πρὸς ἑσπέραν*) 'whereas Ogilia is near Crete'. To one who does not already know the answer, *ἐντὸς* in that sentence means nothing at all: but to one who does, it is a word sufficient by itself. It means

inside, just inside, the narrows of the Straits. Their narrowest portion is on the line between Tarifa and Pta. Cires. Perejil, the only island in the Straits, lies to the eastward, just inside that line; and so of course does the mountain of Atlas, Gibel Musa. (The Garden of the Hesperides, therefore, will not be far beyond the threshold of the Straits—and hence their name. They are daughters of the Sunset.)

(3) Alike in the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and in Hesiod, the abode of Styx (according to Hesiod the elder sister of Calypso) is, as we have seen, also *πείρασιν ἐν γαίης*, in the Straits, at the limits of Earth and Ocean. The water of Styx in *Theogony* 805-6 is called *ἄφθιτον . . . ὠγύγιον*, unceasing and 'ogygian': and according to the scholiast mentioned in (2) above, the name of Calypso's island in Hesiod, as well as in the *Odyssey*, was *Ogygia*. The word 'ogygian' is said by the scholiast to mean 'very ancient', to be connected, perhaps, with the name of Ogyges, an ancient king of Attica. This sounds a little doubtful, but whatever the word may mean, in conjunction with other things it settles the identity of Calypso's islet once and for all.

¶12 (1) In Hesiod the Sirens, as we are told by the Scholiast on Apollonius, *Arg.* iv. 892, (*Cat.* 47) were *three* in number. Their island was called Anthemoessa. Their names were Thelxiope (or Thelxinoe), Molpe, and Aglaophonos. The Scholiast on *Od.* xii. 168, on the words *αὐτίκ' ἔπειτ' ἄνεμος μὲν ἐπαύσατο . . .* says 'It was for this reason' (*ἐντεῦθεν*) 'that Hesiod says they charmed even the winds'. In that statement, according to the present argument, the Scholiast will have been wrong. It would have been the other way about. Hesiod wrote first.

Our poet has told us clearly enough that the Sirens' island lay between Circe's abode (i.e. on Ustica) and the Planctae, which, it turns out, have been suggested to him by the three scoria-cones of Vulcanello. He has borrowed the name of the *Σειρῆνες*, and their sweet singing, from Hesiod (as he has borrowed the names of the Cyclopes, Aeolus, the Laestrygonians, Circe and Calypso); but he uses the Sirens likewise very much for his own allegorical purposes—or so I believe.⁴⁶ He speaks of their *λειμῶν' ἀνθεμόεντα* but gives their island no name. The one and only clue to its actual identity is that he goes out of his way to tell us that there are *two* Sirens, not three as in Hesiod, using the dual for them in xii. 167—'the Sirens twain'. This I now think makes it certain that of all the Aeolian Islands (it must be one of them) Salina or Didyme, with its very symmetrical and remarkable twin cones, is the Sirens' Island of the *Odyssey*. I take this opportunity of correcting the

doubts I expressed about it in *RAO* Ch. IX. As Hesiod however appears to have known that Circe's isle was Ustica, and as Apollonius, following Hesiod, called the Sirens' island Anthemoessa, knowing also that it was one of the Aeolian Isles,⁴⁷ Alicudi (Ericoessa or Heather Island) and Filicudi (Phoenicoessa or Crimson Island) both suggest themselves as possible alternatives for the Sirens' isle in Hesiod.

(2) Of the Planctae, Scylla, and Charybdis no word is found in the Hesiodic poems, save that the name only of Scylla (according to the Scholiast on Apollonius, *Arg.* iv. 828) occurred in the *Great Eoiae*⁴⁸ as that of the daughter of Phorbas and Hecate. These tales appear to have been our poet's own invention, made up from sights that he himself had seen, and topography still to be photographed in the Bocche di Vulcano.⁴⁹

(3) There is also no mention in Hesiod of the Thrinacian Isle or the Cattle of the Sun. It is to be noted however that Syracusan Ortygia, the site of that episode, I believe,⁵⁰ is known to him, being mentioned in the lines quoted from *Ox. Pap.* 1358 fr. 2 at the end of ¶ 3 above. Shortly afterwards, moreover, in that fragment, mention of Poseidon, Odysseus, and Calypso follows (§ 10 above). This sets us wondering, but proves nothing about the episode in question.

(4) There is no mention in the Hesiodic poems of Scheria or Nausicaa or the Phaeacians, nor is there any certain reference to the Phaeacian episode. One of the scholiasts on *Od.* vii. 54 says that 'Hesiod took Arete to be the sister of Alcinous'. This certainly sounds authentic, and our poet certainly does appear to be quoting from some earlier source; but the whole thing is made rather doubtful by the statement in *Theogony* 1017 that Calypso was the mother by Odysseus of Nausithous, who in the *Odyssey* is the father of Alcinous and the founder of Scheria. It may indeed have been another Nausithous in Hesiod: but it may also have been a different Alcinous and a different Arete for all we know.

(5) Nor is there any word extant in Hesiod of the return to Ithaca or of Penelope and the story of the suitors. Except for the mention of Laertes as Odysseus's father (*Cat.* 68, 22) and of Telemachus as marrying Nestor's daughter Polycaste, and becoming the sire of one Persepolis by her, there is nothing.

It may indeed be true that many such omissions might be accidental. But however many there may have been, I feel sure it would still remain true that Hesiod could never be shown to have been acquainted with our *Odyssey*; whereas to refute the argument that our poet knew and used Hesiod would still remain impossible.

I would draw attention to the fact that there is no reference in Hesiod to the all-important scenes for which, in my belief, the scenery of Trapani has been used—those of Polyphemus, that is to say, and those in the Land of the Phaeacians and the Land of Ithaca.

It seems to me that a new understanding of the *Odyssey* has shed a new and fascinating light on Hesiod, and to some extent upon the *Iliad* also. The light is reflected back upon the *Odyssey* itself and illuminates everything that it falls upon. It shows that the poet is indeed using traditional materials to a more positive extent than had been realized; but it shows also his own creative imagination constantly at work in doing so. I would conclude by reiterating my conviction, already stated in *RAO*, that so far from being charming nonsense by a senile Homer or a somewhat slap-dash and haphazard compilation by many generations of unlettered minstrels, there is no work in European literature, from the *Aeneid* to *Hamlet* and *Twelfth Night*, that bears more unmistakably than the *Odyssey* the stamp of its author's own unrepeatable individuality and humour—whatever his indebtedness to others may have been.

APPENDIX

THROUGH the courtesy of the Colonial Secretary, the Crown Colony of Gibraltar, and the Cave Research Leader at the Calpe Institute, to whom my letter of inquiry was passed, I have to thank Mrs P. Clark, the latter's Secretary, for further information concerning the Gibraltar caves.

St. Michael's Cave has been known since antiquity, the earliest mention of it occurring in Bk. ii 95 of Pomponius Mela (himself a native of those parts) written about A.D. 40. In later days the cave is known to have been fortified with a wall and used by Moors and Spaniards as a stronghold, for the good reason that water was always to be obtained there. (See F. Carter, *A Journey from Gibraltar to Malaga*, London, 1777, Vol. I, pp. 40-46.) 'There is today a continuous dripping from the roof in places,' says Mrs Clark, 'and puddles lie in hollows on the floor. After rain the amount of water increases enormously.' The main hall of the cave is separated from a lower floor (126 ft. below), and from a great complex of caverns at yet lower levels (219 to 235 ft. below), by a *precipice* which runs diagonally across the whole length of its floor, a distance of some 200 feet. 'The only place where a steady trickle of water can now fall over the precipice is a small pool near the edge . . .; but the fact that the cave was used as a stronghold or even a reservoir in antiquity indicates a very good supply of water in previous years. This water could have run down towards the precipice and overflowed at one point . . .; or perhaps have run down the gorge . . . marked on the plan, and then over the precipice. This could well account for the 'down-falling water of Styx'.'

The description of the House of Styx in the *Theogony* agrees accurately with the nature of the cave. 'The many stalagmite pillars it contained' (a

Hesiod and the 'Odyssey'

number of which have been removed in recent years) 'would indeed have shone with silvery brilliance when light was reflected from their surface; but smoke from torches through the ages has coated them with a thick layer of grime.' As for the "long rocks" of the roof (*Theogony* 778) Mrs Clark writes: 'Owing to the unusually steep angle of dip (about 65°) the bedding planes of the rock in which the cave is formed are almost vertical, and the plan of the roof from north to south is something like this' (a sketch follows). 'The lengths of rock between the bedding planes immediately catch the eye and the entire cave is 'roofed over' with them.'¹

During the 1939-45 war a hospital was built in St Michael's Hall and a tunnel for ventilation purposes was driven from the outer face of the Rock into the back of the cave at the foot of the precipice. As a result of blasting operations part of the floor collapsed and opened a passage to a new set of caverns (entirely distinct from those already mentioned) now known as New St Michael's. No connexions between these and those of old St Michael's have been found, though at one point they are less than thirty feet apart. It is not impossible however that such connexions may have once existed. New St Michael's appears to have air currents of its own and evidences of flowing water: it contains also a small lake.

As for the passage quoted in ¶ 8 from the *Penny Cyclopaedia*, Mrs Clark remarks that the first part of it is quite true, but the rest of it inaccurate. In 1838 the cave had been penetrated only to a depth of about 180 ft. below the main floor level and the sound of the sea certainly could not really be heard in the caverns blow. That and the tale of mephitic vapours cannot be accepted. On the other hand the "deadly fumes" might easily have been imagined from a sort of mistiness due to the high humidity of the cave mingling with the smoke of torches; while sea sounds are by no means difficult to imagine in the oppressive darkness, imaginary though they really are. Most people, it seems, have that experience. 'From the foregoing,' she wrote, 'you may see that it would have been very natural for any person to transform a visit to St Michael's into a visit to the House of Styx. . . . St Michael's Cave certainly measures up to the description.'

NOTES

¹ University of New Zealand Press, Wellington. (Cited *SOO*.)

² A. M. Hakkert, Amsterdam. (Cited *RAO*.)

³ See his pp. 231ff, 242. See also note 29 below and ¶ 9 *ad fin*.

⁴ *Catalogues* 45 in Evelyn-White, Loeb Ed. of *Hesiod and the Homeric Hymns*; cf. *Od.* xii 70, and *Oxford Classical Dictionary* s.v. Argonauts.

⁵ According to the argument of *RAO*, to be placed on the northern slopes of Mt Eryx.

⁶ On the island of Stromboli.

⁷ At and around Castellammare del Golfo.

⁸ The isle of Ustica.

⁹ The modern Ceuta and the tidal currents in the Straits of Gibraltar.

¹⁰ On Salina-Didyme. (See ¶ 12 below).

¹¹ The three scoria-cones of Vulcanello, now extinct.

¹² Beside the Faraglione (a tuff-cone now extinct) near the foot of the Gran Cratere of Vulcano Island.

¹³ In the Fossa Antica on its western face.

¹⁴ Syracusan Ortygia.

¹⁵ On Gibel Musa above Perejil Island in the Straits.

¹⁶ Trapani and neighbourhood.

¹⁷ *Ibidem*, so far as its scenery is concerned.

¹⁸ For this discussion the Loeb Edition of *Hesiod and the Homeric Hymns*, H. G. Evelyn-White, 1920, with its very good index, has been used.

¹⁹ His account of the Elymi and the Phoenicians in that chapter at once elucidates, and is itself corroborated by, our *Odyssey*.

²⁰ Cf. Strabo, 1. 2. 10 on the one-eyed Arimaspians; and various discussions of this *Märchen* in Edd. and elsewhere.

²¹ As suggested by Samuel Butler, *The Authoress of the Odyssey*, 1897, and as argued in *SOO* and *RAO*, Trapanese scenery has been used for Ithaca as well as Scheria. Cf. also *RAO* p. 150.

²² Cf. Strabo, vi. 2. 11. *RAO*, p. 51.

²³ *Od.* xi. 259.

²⁴ I see no grave difficulty in calling the Dead the Folk of Dreams; or in the anomalies in the tales of the visit to the Field of Asphodel and the Underworld, which Professor Page has discussed in *The Homeric Odyssey*. That Odysseus should have been above ground at the end of it all is just how things might happen in the Land of Dreams; one idea suggests another, one moment we are here, and the next without logical explanation somewhere else. My view is that the poet simply did not bother about such incoherences in this tale, and knew that his audience would not bother either.

²⁵ Hence no doubt the name. Cf. also *Iliad* xviii. 397-403.

²⁶ Cf. *Iliad* xiv. 200 f. 302 f. *et al.*

²⁷ I have the word *αιαι* in mind. Osteodes being an isle of imprisonment and fear.

²⁸ The probability being corroborated by other topographical agreements between H. and the O. which can be more definitely proved. See below.

²⁹ Hesiod's longest sea-voyage (*W. & D.* 648 ff.) had been across the Euripus from Aulis to Euboea—some four or five miles only. This, I would suggest, will be the reason why Alcinous in *Od.* vii. 321-8 is made to speak so surprisingly of Euboea, in the very centre of the Greek world, as being 'the farthest of lands according to some of our folk who have seen it . . .'; and to claim at the same time that his young men had rowed their vessel there and back in a single day, without the least discomfort! This suggestion by itself would not be possible to prove; but it does not stand alone.

(a) Such cryptic literary jokes certainly occur, in the *Odyssey*—in connexion with the *Iliad* (see *RAO* pp. 178-184) and in connexion with a sea-voyage similar, I believe, to the one under discussion, in distance and duration, both in fact and fiction—viz. from 'Scheria' to 'Ithaca' and back: (see *RAO*, 150, *SOO*, 31-2). In the present context, then, our poet will be indulging in a jest at the no doubt conscious naivety of *W. & D.* 650-1, Tityos and Rhadamanthus being thrown in merely as a suitable pretext for its inclusion.

(b) In conjunction with the foregoing, other indications that our poet knew the *W. & D.* (as he certainly knew the *Theogony* and *Catalogues*) become more cogent. Compare *W. & D.*, 495, . . . *ἐνθα κ' ἄοικνος ἀνὴρ μέγα οἶκον ὀφέλλοι* and *Od.* x. 84 *ἐνθα κ' ἄνπνος ἀνὴρ δοιοὺς ἐξήρατο μισθοὺς* (cf. Allen, *App. crit. ad loc.*). In x. 86 moreover, only two lines further on, our poet certainly parodies, or makes use of, *Theogony* 748 (see ¶ 9 below *ad fin.*). In view of this the presumption is overwhelmingly strong that our poet looked on Hesiod as the author both of the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days*.

(c) Compare also *W. & D.* 705 and *Od.* xv. 357 (cf. Wilamowitz, *Hesiodos' Erga*, Berlin, 1928, p. 121). I should think we ought perhaps to read *δαλοῦ καὶ ἐν ὠμῷ γήραι θῆκεν* in the *Works and Days* as our poet

appears to have done. (See also Evelyn-White p. 54, n. 2). Other similarly obvious parallels amongst several considered by van der Valk, *Textual Criticism of the Odyssey* (Leiden 1949), p. 231 ff. are *W. & D.*, 317 and *Od.* xvii. 347; *W. & D.* 93 and *Od.* xix. 360. *Od.* xviii. 18, and indeed the whole tale of Irus, might have been suggested by *W. & D.* 26—καὶ πτωχὸς πτωχῷ ψθονέει. Written copies of the *Iliad* and Hesiod must surely have been available in the 7th century B.C. when our *Odyssey* was composed.

³⁰ I would take this opportunity of correcting an error on p. 77 of my *RAO*. The Levanter is generally a true easterly.

³¹ This we find from xi. 21 means 'when you have practically passed through Ocean'. They have another two or three miles to walk 'beside the stream of Ocean' before they get to the place of which Circe had told them, where the other two rivers meet (x. 515) and 'Ocean' actually begins.

³² Cf. *RAO* pp. 78, 95.

³³ And yet, almost incredibly, the Alexandrine critics rejected *Od.* xi, 157-9, with the approval of modern editors.

³⁴ *Od.* xi. 13, also called πείρατα γαίης, iv. 563; cf. *Iliad* viii. 479 (πείρατα γαίης καὶ πόντοιο); xiv. 200, 301 (πείρατα γαίης Ὠκεανόν τε); Hesiod *W. & D.* 169; *Theog.* 518. 736-9, 807-9. See also Pliny *H.N.* proem to Bk. iii, origo 'terrarum orbis' ab occasu solis et Gaditano freto etc. These references are all of course to the Pillars of Hercules and the narrows of the Straits, the *limen interni maris*, as Pliny calls it.

³⁵ *RAO* pp. 72, 78.

³⁶ This epithet is important, as will be seen.

³⁷ My italics.

³⁸ Cf. Moulinier, *Quelques Hypothèses Relatives à la Géographie d'Homère dans l'Odyssée*, p. 67. I think of course that he is very wrong in saying that the passage has been borrowed from the *Odyssey* 'par le Ps. Hésiode'.

³⁹ Cf. Aristoph. *Frogs*, 942; and the poet's way with similes *RAO* p. 182-3.

⁴⁰ *RAO* ch. IV.; ¶ 3 above *ad fin.*

⁴¹ The 'great οὐδός of bronze' at the entrance to the House of Styx and Hades will quite probably have been drawn from a real οὐδός of stone—described by Carter, 1777 (see Appendix), as 'the remains of a strong wall, forming a platform twenty feet long, before the mouth of the cave'. It has now unfortunately been done away with.

⁴² These heroes must have exercised some sort of thalassocracy over the noble Tyrsenians before they, or their descendants, settled down in what later became the Ager Latinus! It might now be guessed that 'Uluxe' and 'Odysseus' were originally heroes of different nationalities who became identified with one another as did Melkart and Heracles. (Cf. Lewis and Short s.v. *Ulixes*; E. D. Phillips, *J.H.S.* Vol. 73-4, 1953-4, *Odysseus in Italy*).

⁴³ I see no other satisfactory explanations for the use of Trapanese scenery for Ithaca.

⁴⁴ Cf. *RAO* pp. 86, 87.

⁴⁵ ¶¶ 5, 6 above.

⁴⁶ *RAO* Ch. IX.

⁴⁷ *Arg.* iv. 917-9.

⁴⁸ Evelyn-White p. 263.

⁴⁹ *RAO* Ch. II.

⁵⁰ *Ib.* Ch. V.

⁵¹ My italics.

MASSINGER'S USE OF HIS SOURCES FOR 'THE ROMAN ACTOR'

C. A. GIBSON

University of Otago

IN 1691 Langbaine directed readers of *The Roman Actor* to consult 'Suetonius in the Life of Domitian, Aurelius Victor, Eutropius, Lib. 7, Tacitus, Lib. 13, etc.'¹ It has since been agreed that Suetonius is a major source for the play, but the other items on Langbaine's list have not met with the same general acceptance. Dio Cassius has been ranked with Suetonius as a second major source, and scholars have variously added as supplementary sources Horace's *Sermones*, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and Martial's *Epigrammata* to some or all of the names given by Langbaine. It will be argued later that Juvenal's *Saturae* must also be considered as source material.

Obviously there is considerable disagreement about sources, and more important still, little attention has been given to Massinger's handling of the material.

The purpose of this article is first to show the actual sources for the play and to indicate how far Massinger relied on them, and secondly to trace some of the ways in which he refashions them. A shaping moral purpose underlies Massinger's adaptation of his sources to the dramatic patterns of his day. The richly detailed historical accounts of Domitian's life are reduced to a plot involving conflict between a stock tyrant and a gallery of conventional revengers assembled against him: Domitia, the woman of passion, avenging the death of her husband Lamia and her lover Paris; Parthenius, a pious son, avenging his father Philargus's death; Julia and Domitilla, two noble relatives, and Stephanos, a loyal servant, avenging their loss of honour. But on a deeper level Massinger fashions a structure through which he explores the implications and consequences to society of rule by a king whose will dominates his reason.

Koeppel and Sandidge have already fully established that Massinger's chief source was Suetonius's life of Domitian in Book VIII of *De Vita Caesarum*.² But Suetonius is followed closely only for Act V, which covers the rapid succession of events leading up to the emperor's assassination. Elsewhere Massinger freely elaborates or compresses. Act I, scene iv, for instance, in which Domitian makes a triumphal entry after his German campaigns,

then insults the three imperial princesses gathered to meet him and proclaims Domitia as Augusta, is built out of three quite unrelated incidents from Suetonius.³ The triumph, according to the historian, took place in the middle years of Domitian's reign, the insult was given before his accession and to only one of Massinger's trio, and Domitia was given the title Augusta early in the reign, on the birth of a son to the emperor.

Almost all the major events in the play are based on Suetonius, together with much more of its detail than previous scholars have realised; though even here Massinger alters nearly everything that he borrows. For example, the Roman historian records that as part of his campaign to correct public morality Domitian came down heavily on authors who lampooned distinguished men and women. (VIII, 8.) This fact is used in the play, but the emperor is given no credit for the measure; instead it is changed into a malicious charge against the acting profession spoken by the consul and informer Aretinus:

You are they

That search into the secrets of the time,
And, under feigned names, on the stage, present
Actions not to be touch'd at; and traduce
Persons of rank and quality of both sexes,
And, with satirical and bitter jests,
Make even the senators ridiculous
To the plebeians.

(I, iii, 36-43)

This is fairly characteristic of Massinger's free yet purposeful treatment of his borrowings from his major source.

The importance of Suetonius as a source is obvious enough; it is rather more difficult to determine the extent of Massinger's indebtedness to Dio Cassius, since the Greek historian often agrees in detail with the Roman at a point where borrowing has taken place. Yet what evidence there is suggests that Dio's *Roman History* was never more than a supplementary source.

Only once does Massinger follow his account of the life of Domitian at all closely. This is in the scene (V, i) which explains Domitia's break from her husband and her part in the conspiracy against him. In the last act of the play Domitian decides to have his wife killed, after a violent quarrel in which she taunts him with her love for Paris. He enters her name in a table-book containing a list of those he has proscribed, then falls asleep. Parthenius has been watching him and goes to warn Domitia who steals the list

and, learning of the fate intended for her, joins the conspirators. Suetonius says very briefly that Domitia was only privy to the plot; Dio's much fuller account is clearly the source for this episode. 'Domitia was ever an object of Domitian's hatred . . . and the others no longer loved him . . . Domitian, having become suspicious of these persons, conceived the desire to kill them all at the same time, and wrote their names on a two-leaved tablet . . . one of the whispering boys filched it away. Domitia then chanced upon it, and reading what was written, gave information of the matter to those concerned.'⁴ Apart from Massinger's economical substitution of Domitia for the whispering boy who filched the tablet, the historical source agrees perfectly with the play. Only one thing is missing. Dio does not give any reason for the enmity between Domitian and his wife, whereas Massinger relates it to the affair with Paris. This small but important link between Domitia's part in the conspiracy and her illicit love for Paris probably came from the *Epitome de Caesaribus*, an anonymous work long associated with the name of Aurelius Victor,⁵ which states quite baldly that Domitia, the wife of the tyrant, was admitted to the plot, fearing him because of her love for the actor Paris whom the emperor had crucified. (*Epitome*, XI, 11.) On the basis of this suggestion Massinger seems to have constructed the violent quarrel over Paris which supplies a motive for the subsequent behaviour of Domitian and his wife as recorded by Dio.

A few additional details can be traced to the *Roman History*. The most important of them is the chain of references to Domitian's worship of Minerva prompted by Dio's statement that she was the goddess he revered most. (LXVII. 1.) From Act III onwards Massinger develops Minerva as a natural symbol for reason or rational action, using references to the goddess to point up the theme of will or appetite in conflict with reason. Domitian is frequently shown appealing to Minerva in contexts involving such a clash. In Act IV, scene ii, for instance, he discovers his wife in Paris's arms and orders her death:

What power

Her beauty still holds o'er my soul, that wrongs
Of this unpardonable nature cannot teach me
To right myself and hate her! — Kill her. — Hold!
Oh that my dotage should increase from that
Which should breed detestation! By Minerva,
If I look on her longer, I shall melt,
And sue to her, my injuries forgot. (141-148)

Massinger's use of sources for 'The Roman Actor'

In Act V, scene i, after seeking help from Minerva, Domitian finally breaks from his dotage and signs his wife's death warrant, but this return to rational action comes too late to save him. In a vision (founded on complementary descriptions by Suetonius and Dio) he sees Minerva disarmed and removed by Jove, and shortly afterwards, deluded by false hopes, he foolishly dismisses his guard, so putting himself into the power of the conspirators.

Tacitus was the quarry for two brief passages in the play. In Act I, scene ii, the Stoic Rusticus tells his friends how in gratitude for his escape during the Vitellian Wars Domitian built a temple to Jupiter, and

proudly plac'd his figure
In the bosom of the god.

(104-105)

Suetonius mentions the escape as well as the building of a new temple to Jupiter but does not connect the two. There is no mention of either in Dio. Chapter 74 of Book III of the *Histories* gives the full story of the escape, and its conclusion reads: 'On his own succession to the imperial power Domitian consecrated a huge temple to Jupiter Custos, with an effigy of himself in the arms of the god.' Secondly, in Act II, scene i of *The Roman Actor* it is suggested that Domitian forced Agricola to name him as co-heir, and then had him poisoned. Suetonius does not list Agricola among the many victims of Domitian, and Dio says only that he was murdered by the emperor. Tacitus supplies both charges in the calculated insinuations of chapter 43 of his *Agricola*.

Beyond these particular passages there is a more general indebtedness. The portrait of Domitian which emerges from the *Agricola*, and is given added force by the bitter comments of Juvenal in his *Saturae*, is clearly the groundwork for Massinger's conception of 'this prodigy of mankind, bloody Domitian.'

There are other, more specific reasons for considering Juvenal as a source for *The Roman Actor*. Both Suetonius and Dio refer uncritically to Domitian's love for his niece Julia,⁶ but Massinger turns the relationship into something close to rape and lays much stress on its incestuous nature. Such an emphasis may well come from Juvenal, who, in a bitter passage in the Second Satire, speaks of 'that adulterer [Domitian] who, after lately defiling himself by a union of the tragic style, revived the stern laws that were to be a terror to all men . . . at the very moment when Julia was giving birth to abortions that displayed the likeness of her uncle.' (29-33.)

Massinger is also indebted to Juvenal's *Saturae* for much in his conception of the Roman Actor. Suetonius, Dio Cassius, and the

epitomist supply nothing more than his name and profession, his position as lover of Domitia, and conflicting accounts of his death at the hands of Domitian (none of which Massinger uses). In the play, however, Paris holds 'grace and power with Caesar,' he is consistently loyal to the emperor's service, and exercises considerable influence at court. The other writers on whom Massinger draws all treat Paris as a nonentity; Juvenal alone describes him as a powerful court favourite. In his Seventh Satire he admits that 'Statius may be a popular writer. But although his verses have brought down the house, poor Statius will starve unless he sells his new play *Agave* to Paris; for it is Paris who appoints men to military commands, it is Paris who puts the golden ring round the poet's finger after six months of service. You can get from a stage-player what no great man will give you.' (86-90). Juvenal's Paris freely dispenses army commissions and rewards poets with official positions: in Massinger's play the actor Aesopus praises Paris for his bounty to his fellows, and the courtier Parthenius tells him

'Tis confess'd many men owe you
For provinces they ne'er hop'd for; and their lives
Forfeited to his anger.

(II, i, 77-79)

The statement that Paris has saved many from Domitian's fury is, of course, Massinger's addition; and it illustrates neatly the very different purposes of the two writers. Juvenal is attacking the political power of the *histrion*; Massinger, among other things, is defending the acting profession on the usual grounds of its moral influence. So in his play Paris remains the Juvenalian powerful royal favourite, but is shown as exercising that power wisely and humanely.

There is little to add to previous accounts of the sources of the three plays within the play. The first, *The Cure of Avarice*, was, as Domitia says, 'filched from Horace.' To be more precise, it is based on a passage in the Third Satire of Book II. For the second play Massinger used Ovid's account of the story of Iphis and Anaxerete in Book XIV of the *Metamorphoses*. The last inset play, *The False Servant*, seems to be original, though it has several analogues, among them the story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife in *Genesis*, 39. It is suggestive of Massinger's purpose that the Horatian satire to which he turned for the material of the Philargus episode has as its theme the idea that all but the wise man, the *sapiens*, are mad; suggestive too that among the examples given by Horace are the miser, the ambitious man, and the lover.

Massinger's use of sources for 'The Roman Actor'

These then were Massinger's classical sources for *The Roman Actor*: Suetonius, Dio Cassius, Tacitus—the *Histories* and *Agricola*, Juvenal, and the *Epitome De Caesaribus*, together with minor borrowings from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Horace's *Sermones*.

Characteristically, much of the language of the play is derivative. Besides repeating his own clichés, Massinger introduces translations of Latin tags, and the frequent echoes of his contemporaries which are a feature of his style. As T. S. Eliot noted, Webster's *Duchess of Malfi* provided two borrowings; there are half a dozen Shakespearian reminiscences; but by far the greatest number of verbal borrowings come from Jonson's *Sejanus*. There are over forty of them, and they range in length from two or three words to considerable speeches.⁷ Several of Massinger's speeches have been given the rhetorical and conceptual framework of speeches from *Sejanus*, among them the whole of Paris's much-praised oration in defence of the acting profession which is patterned on Cremutius Cordus's defence before Tiberius.⁸ Another example is Latinus's speech in *The Roman Actor*:

Pleasures of worse natures
Are gladly entertain'd, and they that shun us,
Practise in private sports the stewes would blush at.
A litter borne by eight Liburnian slaves,
To buy diseases from a glorious strumpet,
The most censorious of our Roman gentry,
Nay, of the guarded robe, the senators,
Esteem an easy purchase. (I, i, 13-20)

The model for this is a short speech from Sabinus in the opening scene of Jonson's play:

Alas! these things
Deserve no note, conferr'd with other vile
And filthier flatteries, that corrupt the times;
When, not alone our gentries chief are fain
To make their safety from such sordid acts;
But all our consuls, and no little part
Of such as have been praetors, yea, the most
Of senators, that else not use their voices,
Start up in public senate and there strive
Who shall propound most abject things, and base.
(40-41)

The nature of the borrowings argues complete familiarity with

the earlier play, for they cover the entire work and several correspondences from widely separated places may appear together in *The Roman Actor* in a single scene or speech. For example, part of a speech from Silius in the first scene of *Sejanus*,

Our looks are call'd to question, and our words
How innocent soever, are made crimes;
We shall not shortly dare to tell our dreams,
Or think, but 'twill be treason.

(67-70)

together with something said by Latiaris in Act IV, scene iii, 36-37,

What will become of us or of the times
When, to be high or noble, are made crimes?

is fused in one of the key speeches of Massinger's play:

So dangerous the age is, and such bad acts
Are practis'd everywhere, we hardly sleep,
Nay, cannot dream, with safety. All our actions
Are call'd in question; to be nobly born
Is now a crime, and to deserve too well,
Held capital treason.

(I, ii, 70-75)

Supporting these verbal correspondences are many situations common to both plays. Massinger's exposition, a discussion of the degeneracy of Rome by a group of disgruntled nobles, is also Jonson's; his second scene, in which Parthenius tells Domitia that the emperor has chosen her, is patterned on Act II, scene i of *Sejanus*, in which Livia is courted by Sejanus and congratulated for it by the physician Eudemus. The whole of Massinger's third scene, the arraignment of Paris, for which there was no classical source, is modelled even more closely on the trial of Cordus in Act III of Jonson's play. The conclusion is almost inescapable that in ordering the mass of unworked material provided by his classical sources Massinger fell back on some of the dramatic patterns from another Roman play whose themes, the fall of a great and arrogant man and the corruption of a whole society, resembled those of his own play.

* * * * *

To consider Massinger's purpose in shaping his source material, a useful point of departure is his treatment of the crucial assassination scene (V, ii, 44f.) Here neither Suetonius nor Dio provided a consistent narrative or a manageable group of characters. He found a usefully detailed account of the actual murder and an

unwieldy list of conspirators, with little or no mention of the motives behind the crime.⁹ Suetonius says that Stephanos, Domitilla's steward, managed to gain private admittance and stabbed the emperor. Domitian resisted, dragging him down. Others came to the steward's assistance, among them Maximus, a freedman of Parthenius, and Satur, and finally despatched their victim. Dio writes that Stephanos, Entellus, Sigerus, and Parthenius were involved, though Parthenius remained outside until after the murder. Others knew of the conspiracy but were absent at the time, among them Domitia. The motive behind the plot is vaguely described as fear; though Suetonius adds that Stephanos was under a charge of embezzlement—not a promising motive for an avenger in Jacobean tragedy.

Massinger treats this material freely. He retains the suggested action (the struggle to kill Domitian), but, ignoring history, assigns Stephanos, Entellus, and Sejeius quite minor places in the scene. The last two in particular appear solely because by using them for the rough and tumble of the assassination itself he can reserve his major characters for a ritual stabbing of the emperor's body, his own addition to the historians' account. This, together with the speeches accompanying it, brings out in a quite formal way the significance of the movement of the whole play. It provides a restatement of the canons Domitian has broken, and links his death to the disorder brought about by his uncontrolled wilfulness.

Only two characters, Stephanos and Parthenius, play a semi-historical part in the scene. The three women Massinger introduces—Domitia, Julia, and Domitilla—are all added to the list of assassins given by the historians. And it is these five, together with Paris and Domitian, who are given leading roles in the plot as a whole.

Massinger's sources supplied little information about Stephanos or Parthenius beyond the fact that one was Domitilla's steward and the other Domitian's chamberlain. The charge against Stephanos is passed over, and he is given the noble and disinterested motive of revenge for Domitilla's loss of honour. In addition he is portrayed as a loyal servant who knows and accepts his place in society, and so is contrasted with the upstart freedman Parthenius who alternately cringes before Domitian, ingratiates himself with Domitia, and displays a haughty arrogance towards Lamia.¹⁰ Parthenius is given a double role. Since his main use is to transact much of the stage business associated with Domitian, Massinger portrays him as a corrupt courtier, servile and self-seeking. On the other hand he gives him the traditional and virtuous motive for

revenge, a father's death, with the result that Parthenius's character becomes a puzzling mixture of perfidy and piety.

As the father, Massinger introduces the miser Philargus.¹¹ But why a miser, since Parthenius's motive for revenge remains, no matter what the nature of his father? Further, why is the greater part of Act II given over to a quarrel between Philargus and his son, a play in which a miser is cured of his avarice, and a final confrontation of Domitian and Philargus which results in the latter's execution? The revenge theme alone does not sufficiently explain the amount of stage time devoted to the miser, and Massinger's insistence on his avarice weakens rather than strengthens this link with the rest of the play.

However the episode is related to the larger themes of the play, and is probably derived from the sources. Suetonius selects avarice and cruelty as the two chief characteristics of Domitian.¹² Now Massinger shows sufficient instances of the emperor's cruelty but makes little mention of his avarice. It may well be that the character of Philargus is based on the Suetonian description of Domitian, Massinger finding it more effective to personify *Cupiditas* in a separate figure than to portray a tyrant who is avaricious as well as cruel. This enables him to clarify and insist on one of the main themes of the play; not that avaricious kings make bad rulers, but that

Such as govern'd only by their will,
And not their reason, unlamented fall;
No good man's tear shed at their funeral.

(V, ii, 91-93)

Philargus, with his irrational lust for money, is intended as an exact counterpart to the wilful Domitian from his very first words to Parthenius:

My son to tutor me! Know your obedience,
And question not my will.

(II, i, 1-2)

The relationship is established in considerable detail. At the beginning of the inset play, *The Cure of Avarice*, Paris comments

We must use
Some means to rouse the sleeping faculties
Of his mind, there lies the lethargy.

(II, i, 319-321)

The means is a dream in which a chest of gold is forced open. It

Massinger's use of sources for 'The Roman Actor'

brings the miser to self-awareness and repentance, just as Domitian's dream of the disarming of Minerva later in the play brings him to a measure of self-knowledge. The miser's awakening cry,

Murther! Murther!

They come to murther me. My son in the plot?

(II, i, 344-345)

similarly points forward, this time to the assassination scene and Domitian's 'My Domitia in the conspiracy!' (Significantly, the miser's words are Massinger's addition to the Latin source). There are many more links of this kind, but even without them the episode sufficiently underlines the folly of uncontrolled appetite and will by its juxtaposition of the avaricious Philargus gloating over his wealth and the lustful Domitian praising the beauty of Domitia.

Domitia is made the instrument of a double revenge, although only the *Epitome* suggests that her complicity had anything to do with the death of either her husband or her lover. She stabs Domitian with the words 'This is for my Paris,' not long after she has told him that by her affair with the actor

Lamia's wrongs,

When thy lust forc'd me from him, are, in me

At the height reveng'd.

(V, i, 76-78)

By his treatment of the Lamia-Domitia relationship Massinger brings into his play the consideration of divine intervention against the otherwise unlimited will of a king. Dio mentions that Domitian forced Lamia to divorce his wife in order to make her his mistress, and Suetonius tells how Lamia was killed several years after the loss of his wife for some harmless joking at Domitian's expense.¹³ Neither historian suggests any link between the divorce, the death of Lamia, and Domitia's part in the assassination of the emperor responsible for both acts. Massinger initially follows Dio for a scene (I, ii) in which Parthenius takes Domitia from her husband, but he fills it out with a clash between the freedman and his victim to bring out the fact that Domitian's will overrides all law and reason. He then shows Lamia's death as following immediately on the loss of his wife, and gives him a prayer for vengeance in which he asks

That this my ravish'd wife may prove as fatal

To proud Domitian, and her embraces

Afford him, in the end, as little joy,

As wanton Helen brought to him of Troy.

(I, iii, 106-109)

The Troy image reappears several times, most significantly when Domitia, courting Paris, tells him

Thou art now my Trojan Paris
And I thy Helen.

(IV, ii, 103-104)

Domitian then prepares to surprise them, commenting 'And I am Menelaus.' In this way, as well as by explicit statement from Domitia and Domitilla, Massinger suggests the operation of divine vengeance.

Domitia's liaison with Paris is also given a new ethical significance. Suetonius alone gives any indication of her character when he says that she denied having committed incest with Titus, though had the charge been true she would have boasted of it as she did of all her other misdeeds. (VIII, *Titus*, 10.) Massinger uses the given trait of the quarrel scene between Domitian and his wife at the beginning of the final act, then, just as he does with Philargus, builds a character which reflects Domitian's in its pride, its cruelty, and its passion. His intention is made clear by Domitia's words to her husband when she is trapped with Paris:

Thy lust compell'd me
To be a strumpet, and mine hath return'd it
In my intent and will, though not in act,
To cuckold thee.

(IV, ii, 135-138)

Her behaviour is interpreted as due to the contagion of Domitian's wilfulness, and it is not surprising to find that Massinger dramatises the affair with the Roman Actor (in the seduction scene in Act IV, scene ii) as a debate between the rational Paris and the passionate Domitia.

The dramatist's treatment of the last two assassins, Julia and Domitilla, can be described more briefly. Both are given the un-historical role of resentful victim of the lust of Domitian and the pride of the empress. Their behaviour serves rather inadequately to define the positive virtue—the Stoic 'passive fortitude'—which Massinger wishes to advance.

The source information about the characters discussed so far was fairly sketchy, and in the main Massinger was left to pattern them on a central figure or to develop them in other ways if he wished, without distorting historical fact. But in Suetonius and Dio he found an account of the life of Domitian rich in illuminating detail, episodic, yet revealing a gradual and consistent development. The historians describe how the ambitions raised by a brief

taste of power were immediately suppressed under Vespasian and Titus, and how, although embittered and jealous, he ruled firmly and justly on his succession until insecurity made him increasingly ruthless and led finally to a reign of terror. Suetonius sums Domitian up, in a passage ignored by Massinger, as 'one made of an equal mixture of virtues and vices, until he turned his virtues too into vices, being, so far as one may conjecture, greedy through lack of money, cruel because of fear.' (VIII, 3.) Massinger's procedure with his central character is therefore of special interest.

Massinger makes no attempt to explain the formation and development of Domitian's character; he rejects the Suetonian formula, *super ingenii naturam, inopia rapax, metu saevus*. Something of the moralist's simplifications, his preference for absolutes, can be seen in the creation of 'bloody Domitian' from his classical sources.

It is a process involving constant alteration and addition. The stature to Jupiter Custos with the obvious symbolism of an effigy of Domitian in its arms is reinterpreted as a monument to the emperor's arrogance.

[He] proudly plac'd his figure
In the bosom of the god.

Suetonius notes that at the beginning of his reign (Dio puts it at Vespasian's accession) Domitian spent hours alone each day catching flies and stabbing them with a needle-sharp stylus.¹⁴ The trait is mentioned in a speech by Lamia:

His greatest pleasure was, being a child,
With a sharp-pointed bodkin to kill flies,
Whose rooms now men supply.

(I, i, 100-103)

Notice how Massinger exaggerates the trait, and how, by making it Domitian's childhood behaviour, he suggests the presence of a fixed and inexplicable sadism which has nothing to do with external circumstances. Besides suppressing every creditable action recorded by the historians, the dramatist introduces fresh crimes from other sources hostile to Domitian, and invents further ones. Drawing together the historical facts that Domitian had the philosopher Rusticus killed, and that after a revolt he had many of the rebels tortured by fire, Massinger constructs a scene (III, i, 1-122) in which the emperor brutally taunts and tortures on stage two philosophers, one of them Rusticus, and then has them killed.¹⁵

The figure who emerges is in many ways the stock tyrant; a given destructive compound of absolute arrogance, cruelty, and lust. But

although Massinger suppresses any historical interpretation of Domitian's character he reshapes it to suit his own moral purpose. He constructs a figure of inflated and inexplicable passions, and traces the cause of his assassination back to a series of actions dictated by impulse, appetite, and will. In *The Roman Actor* (though not according to Massinger's sources) the emperor is killed because of his uncontrolled passion for Domitia, Julia, and Domitilla, and because of a fatal explosion of rage against Philargus when the equally obstinate miser checks his will. So the death is made morally significant, both by the nature of the victim and the motives of the assassins.

NOTES

¹ Gerard Langbaine, *An Account of the English Dramatick Poets*, 1691, 388.

² E. Koepfel, *Quellen-Studien zu den Dramen George Chapmans, Philip Massingers, und John Fords*, QF, LXXXII, 1897, and W. L. Sandidge, *The Roman Actor*, Princeton, 1929.

³ Suetonius VIII, 6; 12; 3.

⁴ Dio Cassius, LXVII, 15.

⁵ Confusion over the authorship of the *Epitome* has led to several errors in descriptions of the sources of *The Roman Actor*. G. E. Bentley, in *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, 1956, vol. IV, repeats W. L. Sandidge's mistake in attributing it to Eutropius.

⁶ Suetonius, VIII, 22; Dio Cassius, LXVII, 3.

⁷ First noted by W. D. Briggs, 'The Influence of Jonson on Tragedy in the 17th Century,' *Anglia*, XXXV (1912).

⁸ *The Roman Actor*, I, iii, 95f.; *Sejanus*, III, i, 407f.

⁹ Suetonius, VIII, 17; Dio Cassius, LXVII, 15; 17.

¹⁰ This is one of the ways in which Massinger suggests the contagion of Domitian's over-reaching pride. Early in the play *Lamia* comments

His freemen
Scorn the nobility, and he himself,
As if he were not made of flesh and blood,
forgets he is a man.

(I, i, 95-98)

¹¹ An appropriate name since it means Lover of Money (coined from *philargyria*, meaning 'avarice').

¹² Suetonius, VIII, *Vespasian*, 1, and elsewhere.

¹³ Dio Cassius, LXV, 3; Suetonius, VIII, 10.

¹⁴ Suetonius, VIII, 3; Dio Cassius, LXV, 9.

¹⁵ This animus against philosophers—and in the play Domitian kills a third, Paetus Thrasea, who, according to history, perished under Nero—is explained by Massinger's theme of will in conflict with reason.

THE TREATMENT OF CLASSICAL MATERIALS IN SOME ENGLISH PLAYS OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

F. H. MARES

University of Adelaide

RALPH ROISTER DOISTER and *Gorboduc* serve as convenient milestones in compendium literary histories, but the direct influence either can have had on popular dramatic practice is probably very slight. Both were written for performance before a select, highly educated audience, and there is no evidence of frequent revivals. The only known edition of *Roister Doister* was not printed until at least twelve years after the play was written, and though *Gorboduc* was printed more rapidly and went into several editions, the Senecal play does not seem to have had success on the popular stage before *The Spanish Tragedy*, a generation later. It is noticeable, even then, that Kyd is dramatically more effective as he moves away from the stylistic model he follows most closely in the opening scenes of the play. Although well known to anyone with any pretensions to education, the stock situations and characters, the stylistic devices and theatrical conventions of Roman comedy and tragedy could not be accepted on the English popular stage until they had been considerably modified, and brought into close relationship with the existing stage tradition. This process of modification, particularly as it affected materials derived from Roman comedy, can be observed going on in the plays of the 'fifties, 'sixties and 'seventies.

These plays can be considered in three groups. First, those that are modelled on the form of classical comedy; second, those that follow this pattern at one remove, and are related to the neo-Latin education drama that flourished in Europe at the Renaissance; finally, those which make use of themes and stories from classical sources while remaining firmly in the popular native tradition so far as their structure—or as some would say, their lack of it—is concerned. This popular tradition can be deduced from those plays which survive from the fifteenth and earlier sixteenth century outside the Mystery Cycles. The action of such plays is usually undivided: though scene may shift and time pass between different episodes, there is no intermission in the playing. The 'story' is usually told in the simplest possible fashion: episode follows episode in chronological sequence, there is little reportage of off-stage happenings and almost never retrospective narration. A fool seems

to have been a universal property of these plays, no matter what their subject. He was on terms of intimacy with the audience and addressed them directly. The dramatist often leaves his part to be extemporised, only indicating that he shall 'make pastime' or 'prolong the time'.¹ When, as so often in printed texts of the sixteenth century, the cast is divided to indicate the doubling necessary so that 'six may play it easily' the fool's part is so important that he takes only very minor rôles in addition. This fool, of course, in some morality plays—and in more plays that are not moralities—is given the title of *The Vice*.

The careful way in which *Roister Doister* follows the pattern of Roman comedy is plain, yet there are still important differences in character and treatment. In place of the silent *Meretrix* of Plautus—whose female characters are rarely more than stage-furniture—we have the independent widow; in place of the impassioned young man we have a worthy sea-captain, and common-sense affection takes the place of sexual infatuation. Instead of being gross, the comedy of the boastful soldier is fantastic. Merry-greek, by his opening confession a Parasite, has lost the harshness and self-seeking of his original. A good deal of the comic business he provides depends on the English, not the classical tradition: his songs are incorporated in the action; the mis-reading of Ralph's letter shows a type of humour common in England from Cain's Garcio in the *Townley Plays* to the prologue to the tedious and brief scene of Pyramus and Thisbe. It became so much a staple of English comedy that it could be left for the performer to improvise. In *All For Money* (1578) is this stage direction:—

Here the Vice shall turn the proclamation to some contrary sense at every time All For Money hath read it, and here followeth the proclamation. (D1 r)

Direct address to the audience is not uncommon in Roman comedy; for example, Charinus opens the *Mercator* by telling his own story and commenting adversely on other lovers in other comedies. But the particular opening of *Roister Doister*, in which the fool anticipates the action and forewarns the audience of the part he is going to take, has closer parallels in plays like *Jack Juggler* or *Respublica* and finds later development in Richard III and Iago.

Gammer Gurton's Needle follows the pattern of Roman comedy even more strictly than *Roister Doister*, but its subject matter is far removed. Rustic stupidity made an occasional scene in Plautus, but his plays are essentially urban in setting as in spirit. Diccon the Bedlam is the manipulator of the plot in *Gammer Gurton*, but

he is no parasite. He is seeking disorder and his own delight when he sets Dame Chat and Gammer Gurton at loggerheads, not gratifying a patron. The rustic fool has been grafted onto the Roman plot-spinner; Diccon brings with him the topsy-turvydom of the folk festival.

In Richard Edwardes' *Damon and Pithias* there is no division into acts and scenes and the time of the action is extended over two months, but the obligation to classical models is apparent in the limitation of place, and the presence of both parasite and ingenious servant. The story of the faithful friends belongs to classical times, but it was popular as an *exemplum* in the middle ages, and Edwardes' treatment is in this tradition. The morality pattern is behind this play, for Dionysus is subject to the flattering parasite Carisophus until he is shocked into virtue by the faithful friends who are each prepared to die for the other. It is the re-establishment of virtue in the court, not the escape of the friends, that is the climax. 'Purged is the court of vice, since friendship entered in' says the good counsellor Eubulus, and as a curtain call the cast sings 'Lord grant her such friends, most noble Queen Elizabeth'. The play was probably performed before her by the Children of the Chapel at Christmas 1564.

Damon and Pithias has scenes of slapstick that are incidental to the main action and plainly traditional. Grimme the Collier comes to the palace with 'coals for the king's own mouth'. Two lackeys persuade him to be shaved in the court fashion and the instrument used is a 'Chopping knife'. The action is not detailed, but those who have seen a ceremonial barbering on a ship crossing the equator will find it easy to imagine.

A similar shaving scene is found in George Whetstone's *Promos and Cassandra* (1578). Whetstone takes a number of his characters direct from the stock of Roman comedy—the parasite, the meretricious, the comic cook. In his dedication he praises the 'old' comedy and takes his own age to task.

And (which is worst) their ground is not so unperfect as their working indiscreet: not weighing so the people laugh, though they laugh them (for their follies) to scorn. Many times (to make mirth) they make a clown companion of a king.²

Yet in spite of his praise of 'Menander, Plautus and Terence' who 'intombed (by their comedies) in honour, live at this day', his own play, though its two parts are divided into five acts each, has many of the tricks of the popular stage, and shows, like *Damon and Pithias*, a strong influence of the morality.

The didactic purpose of the 'education drama' was strong; it desired the linguistic grace and polish of the old plays, without what the austere felt as their danger to the morals of impressionable youth:

Quid iuvat heus iuvenes veteris monumen Terenti
 Aut Plauti, aut Nevi, volvere saepe manu.
 Et spectatori vanas divendere nugas,
 In quibus instruitur desidiosus amor?
 Quin potius placeant divina poemata nostri
 Evangelistae, qui canit ore cato.³

The source of the plots of most of these plays is the parable of the prodigal son, often complicated by duplicating the families or increasing the number of children. It is ironical in so self-consciously Christian a drama that the conclusion of the parable is usually reversed, the offending child punished and his dutiful brother rewarded. One of the most famous of these plays, Fullonius' *Acolastus*, was printed for use as a school-book, with a parallel text in English, in 1540. A later example in English was *Nice Wanton* (1560). Though said to be based on the neo-Latin *Rebelles* of Macropedius, this play has entirely forgotten its origins. The place is anywhere and nowhere, the time takes the children from childhood to maturity, and instead of the parasite or bad servant of the Latin plays there is a morality figure, Iniquity, who leads the elder brother and sister astray. Ismael is hanged, and Dalilah dies of venereal disease, but the irreproachable younger brother Barnabas persuades her to a deathbed repentance, and prevents the mother Xantippe—whose "cockering" was the start of the trouble—from hanging herself. There are a number of these prodigal son plays in English, but most—in spite of the debt of some to Latin originals—have the freedom in time and place, the undivided action, the morality associations and the horseplay and clowning that link them firmly with the native English drama. A formal exception, George Gascoigne's *Glass of Government*, seems to be literary drama rather than a piece for the stage.

An interesting play in the tradition of the education drama is *Misogonus*. This prodigal son is reclaimed to virtue by the discovery of a lost twin brother, so that his father's threats to disinherit him become effective. The fool Cacurgus is, as his Greek name implies, the mischief maker of this play and has similarities both to the parasite and to the tempter of the morality play. He suggests to Misogonus some of his most outrageous actions and at the same time ingratiates himself with the father, Philogonus. When

Classical Plays of the Sixteenth Century

he is turned off at the end of the play his attempt to auction himself to the audience seems to be a recollection of the episode in the *Stichus* where the parasite Gelasimus offers himself to the spectators in exchange for a square meal. (Act I, ii.) Cacurgus is a stage fool, and wears the appropriate costume, which anchors him firmly in the native tradition. He has one scene in which he pretends to be a travelling doctor and offers to cure an old country woman of the toothache. His list of cures and account of the travels he has made is reminiscent of the 'spiel' of the Doctor in the traditional Mummers' plays. He claims to be an 'Egyptian' and says his father was a 'natural Ethiopian', which suggests the blackened face so common in the Mummung plays.

Misogonus seems to combine in itself elements from classical comedy, from the neo-Latin education drama, from the morality play and even from some folk entertainment the relics of which have been preserved in the Mummers' plays. What is remarkable is that this has all been combined in a self-consistent play of some merit. The manuscript is inscribed 'Laurentius Barjona—presumably Lawrence Johnson-Kettering, 1577' and R. W. Bond's suggestion that Johnston⁴ was the Kettering schoolmaster and wrote or refurbished the play for his boys at Christmas is generally accepted. He knew his Plautus and Terence well, but all he borrows is adapted in the light of his knowledge of English drama. He gives his play the formal structure of Roman comedy, with the five-act division (though the last act is missing from the MS) and a fresh scene for the entrance of any major character. The unity of place is respected, and though the action of the play covers a period of several days, or perhaps weeks, it intelligently condenses into that period a story extending over twenty-four years. The plot is taken from the education drama, and from that and the morality come most of the characters with their Greek type-names. But all is changed. The act divisions are formal only: they show the end of one episode and the beginning of another but not an interruption of the playing, which would appear to have been continuous. For example, when act I ends Eupelas leaves the stage saying:

But methinks I hear a ruffianly din

I shall be mischiefed surely if here I do stay.

Act II opens with the stage direction

Clamitant intus servi

Where is he lay hold on him knock him down with

him I will have one joint of some one's flesh

and Misogonus enters brawling because his companions have let

Eupelas escape. In the same way, though plainly recognisable as the type figures of the education drama, the characters are completely English. The servants are Will Waspe and Dick Duckling, and Cacurgus the parasite almost everywhere in the play is called Will Somer.

But not only does Johnson graft his figures to the native tradition, and write a play that, for all its crudeness, does manage to combine the free, rapid, unbroken movement of the popular drama with a sound formal structure; he also suggests the future direction of the drama.

In popular English drama of the sixteenth century the fool was there of right: there was no need to account for his presence—rather the reverse in fact. The nearest equivalent in terms of stage behaviour for the urban parasite of Roman comedy was the stage fool of the English tradition. Cacurgus the stage fool is given a *raison d'être* in *Misogonus* by his position as a household fool—it was certainly not necessary for him to have this naturalistic justification. He is also the major intriguer of the play and, if we think of it in relation to the morality tradition, the tempter into evil. This side of his nature, too, the author has made a serious attempt to motivate. Cacurgus is no longer an accepted type or a useful dramatic convention or an abstraction only, but a person whose malignancy has both a motive and a cause. He resents his motley and he resents his bastardy, and as the natural son of Philogonus it is he who stands to gain by the quarrels between his father and his half-brother.

Who but I make him pastime who charm his none son
And proudly I tell you to every comer
He brags what a natural his luck was to have. (P. 184)

And he goes on to explain how completely and mistakenly Philogonus trusts him. It is not an impossible leap from this pun on 'natural' to Edmund's reflections on 'Fine word, legitimate'.

To turn now to some plays in the popular tradition that were based on classical stories. *Jack Juggler*, a Christmas play of the fifteen-fifties, is a very free treatment of the opening episode of Plautus' *Amphitryon*, but the comic situation of the servant persuaded that he is not himself is worked up into an original drama of sixteenth century social life. The play is called an 'interlude' and Jack Juggler—who plays the trick that Mercury plays—is 'the Vice'. Nothing but the story is recognisably Roman. There are three other plays containing 'Vices' that take their stories from Classical sources; *Horestes*, *Appius and Virginia* and *Cambises*. All three are the work of practical playwrights writing in an estab-

Classical Plays of the Sixteenth Century

lished tradition to please a popular audience. Whatever their printers called them—interlude, tragical comedy, lamentable tragedy mixed full of pleasant mirth—all deal with themes of violence and retribution. The clowning that bulks so large in them must have seemed the greatest impropriety to any critic of classical tastes, but the popular dramatic tradition is strong enough to impose its conventions even on material drawn from classical sources.

In spite of the efforts of the scholars and critics to establish an English drama based on the classics—an attempt that still gets lip-service from Webster in his dedication to *The White Devil*—that drama in its great period remains obstinately fluid and uncontrolled. A great deal was taken over and a great deal was learned from the classical drama. Roman comedy made available a figure who already had some likeness in dramatic function and behaviour to the English stage fool, but had the advantage of being fully worked into a realistic drama. So, in academic plays like *Roister Doister*, the fool loses his motley and the parasite picks up a few stage tricks that do not belong to his classical past. But the native stock reasserts itself over the foreign, though in a modified form. So Phallax (in *Promos and Cassandra*) is more like the English stage fool than Carisophus (in *Damon and Pithias*), while Cacurgus has re-assumed the fool's dress. But though the old dress and antics reappear the old looseness of dramatic organisation does not. Cacurgus is not an entertainer, essential to the play but accidental to the plot: his presence as a domestic fool is explained and his activity as a malicious intriguer is motivated. Without doubt Shakespeare's fools hark back to this strong tradition of stage clowning, but where they make more than a token appearance, they are always part of a complex dramatic structure. Similarly with the organisation of a play's action: the English theatre before the Restoration never fully accepted the five-act division, or the localisation of the stage. Ben Jonson's act-divisions are literary, not theatrical. In *The Alchemist*, for example, there is no break in the action from Act III to Act IV: the playing is continuous. All the same, the great plays of the turn of the century show the result of the interaction of the classical formality and the English fluidity that can be observed in plays of the latter half of the sixteenth century.

The influential plays, for making available to Shakespeare and his contemporaries the resources of the classical drama, were probably not so much those which with deliberate seriousness and high intentions imitate closely an admired model, but those which

Book Reviews

borrow and adapt or even steal from and pervert their classical originals. It is *Cambises*, for all its bustling absurdity, that is the direct ancestor of *King Lear*, not *Gorboduc*.

NOTES

¹ T. Preston, *Cambises* (1585) sig. E2 r.

G. Wapul, *The Tide Tarrieth No Man*, Tudor Facsimile Texts (1910) sig. E3 r.

² *Promos and Cassandra*, Tudor Facsimile Texts (1910) sig. A2 v.

³ *Susanna*, Placentius Evangelisten, (Antwerp, 1534) Epigramma and Lectorem.

⁴ *Early Plays from the Italian*, (Oxford 1909) p. cxviii.

For whom he claimed 'a power of imaginative comic creation surely unequalled in any surviving work before Shakespeare's'.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE *PERSAE* OF AESCHYLUS edited with introduction, critical notes and commentary by H. D. Broadhead. *Cambridge University Press*. pp. lxxiii + 350.

THE *Persians* of Aeschylus is the earliest surviving Greek tragedy and the only surviving Greek tragedy which deals with contemporary events instead of mythology. The publication of a full scale edition is therefore a matter of importance to all students of drama, but time and space here preclude more than a perfunctory welcome to Dr Broadhead's most valuable work, which has been beautifully produced by the Cambridge University Press. Aeschylus' account of the Persian empire and 'the campaigns of 480-479 B.C. are also a primary source for ancient historians, and Dr Broadhead has treated them well with appendices on Persian names and Salamis as well as full discussion of the historical passages in the commentary and the supplementary notes.

This review will be confined to the dramatic and literary aspects of the *Persians*. Dr Broadhead speaks in the introduction of the disadvantageous conditions under which the Antipodean scholar pursues his researches; but with the help of microfilms, inter-library loans, and a visit to Europe he has magnificently surmounted his difficulties, and I have only noticed two further articles which could have helped him: L. J. D. Richardson in *Studies in Honour of Gilbert Norwood* and A. H. Coxon in *Classical Quarterly* 1958; both, I suspect, came out too late, as, although the preface is dated December 1959, the bibliography was closed at the end of 1956. The full discussion of alternative interpretations is one of the merits of this book; the reader is not lost in a flood of all-embracing references, but the important contributions are perspicaciously grouped and firmly but politely assessed. The amount of learning assembled in the commentary is very impressive, and fuller treatment is given to textual criticism in the introduction and to metre in a long appendix: many will find the information collected to be of much wider application, and where no appendix is pro-

Book Reviews

vided they will be guided by the six indices, which include grammar, metre, and style.

The section on textual criticism, describing common transcriptional errors, the principles followed in establishing the text, and the manuscripts and scholia, will be useful to all students of ancient Greek texts as well as to those more specially concerned with Aeschylus and this play. For the purposes of this book Dr Broadhead has established a sort of defence in depth, consisting of obelus, asterisk, critical notes, commentary, and supplementary notes. The obelus is used for passages for which no satisfactory conjecture has been offered; possible emendations are then found in the commentary and less likely ones in the supplementary notes. (It is natural that Dr Broadhead should use the obelus more than the Oxford text which is designed for schoolboys as well as students). The asterisk is used for conjectures received into the text: six of these are Dr Broadhead's own. Of these 76, 870, 922, 975 are minor changes which may very well be right. At 483 'men dying of thirst round a spring' are brilliantly converted into 'men dying of thirst for water'. 114 is more complicated as it involves also one of the many cases where the manuscript reading is possible but unpalatable; these are left in the text, but a warning is given in the critical apparatus which sends the reader to the commentary and supplementary notes (28 of Dr Broadhead's own conjectures are included in the commentary or supplementary notes, and a less modest editor would have inserted most of them in the text; Dr Broadhead however does not even mention his suggestions for 283, 583, 595, 616, 740 in his critical apparatus. These are all worth consideration though the present reviewer likes the treatment of 237, 292, and 401 less than the rest).

114 may be taken as an example of Dr Broadhead's procedure. It belongs to an ionic system (107-114) which Murray takes as a mesode of nine lines—lonely in a choral ode otherwise made up of five pairs of strophe and antistrophe. Dr Broadhead accepts Seidler for 111: παρασαίνει βροτὸν εἰς ἀρχυαυ ἄτα, and adopts for 113-4 a new combination of Seidler and Wecklein: τόθεν οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλύξαντα φυγεῖν ὑπερθ' ἄνατον. These two conjectures are marked with the asterisk, as being highly probable. They bring the metre of 111-4 into line with 107-10, so that the mesode vanishes in favour of a strophe and antistrophe. But Dr Broadhead feels doubts about 109-10: πηδήματος εὐπετέος ἀνάσσων 'lording an easy leap'; Stahl suggested δηλήματος εὐπετῆς ἀπάσσων 'leaping easily from bane', but here εὐπετῆς 'easy' is nonsense, and Dr Broadhead goes one further with εὐπιθοῦς 'leaping away from a persuasive bane'. This is excellent sense and is well discussed in the commentary and supplementary notes; it may very well be right, but one can only applaud the restraint which relegates a good conjecture, involving considerable changes in three successive words, to the critical apparatus instead of putting it in the text.

Many more passages should and will be discussed in detail. Here it may be more useful to say something of the more general topics raised in the introduction. Dr Broadhead has no doubt that the *Persians* is a tragedy in the normal sense of the word: 'we might almost say that the (historical) facts have been altered so as to fit into the dramatist's theological framework'. And by an examination of key passages Aeschylus is acquitted of silly charges of Athenian jingoism, anti-Spartan bias, or anti-Persian caricature. Perhaps Dr Broadhead is a little too kind to those critics who find the chorus at the end too outspoken for Persian councillors; I doubt whether we know enough about the technique of laments (on which Dr Broadhead has a most useful appendix) to say this.

Book Reviews

In the section on dramatic technique also Dr Broadhead successfully defends Aeschylus against the charges of critics who expect him to have digested the *Poetics* of Aristotle a century and a half before it was written. This is archaic tragedy written in archaic technique; and if the raising of the ghost or the lonely return of Xerxes is inadequately prepared, presumably Aeschylus wanted the effect of surprise in the ghost scene and knew that Xerxes must be alone with the chorus at the end.

The question of staging is difficult, but Dr Broadhead rightly argues for simplicity and notes that Aeschylus did not demand spatial any more than temporal realism. The *Persians* was acted in the pre-Periclean theatre, but we must assume for that theatre a stage building with a single practicable door facing the audience, through which a platform (*ekkyklema*) could be rolled to show interiors etc. (Cf. *Rylands Bulletin*, 42 (1960), 498 f.). The stage building must have been the 'ancient building' before which the chorus assemble (141) and in which they are proposing to take their seats when they are prevented by the Queen's arrival. But the ghost of Darius must also have risen centrally (as the Eastern king is shown rising centrally to the astonishment of the chorus on an Attic red-figure vase in Corinth, which may possibly be a contemporary illustration of the *Persians*): it seems to me a reasonable guess that the tomb of Darius was rolled out on the *ekkyklema* and rolled back again when Darius sank back behind it.

The *Persians* was produced in Sicily as well as Athens and some scholars have found traces of the Sicilian version surviving in our texts. Dr Broadhead regards this as an interesting possibility and it must have needed all his charity to concede this much. He might perhaps have noted that the production in Syracuse, which on the evidence of the *Life* was later than the Athenian production in 472 B.C., may nevertheless have coincided with the production of the *Aetnaean Women*, if this was produced not when the city was founded in 476 B.C. but when Deinomenes, son of Hiero, was made its ruler in 470 B.C. In Athens the *Persians* was produced with the *Phineus*, the *Glaukos Potnieus*, and the satyr play *Prometheus Pyrkaieus*; that the last two are rightly identified need not, I think, be doubted; the new papyrus extracts from them are conveniently found in Professor H. Lloyd Jones' supplement to the new edition of the Loeb *Aeschylus*. The satyr play was evidently a favourite, and the later red-figure vases collected by Sir John Beazley in *American Journal of Archaeology* 43 (1939) 619 ff. were probably inspired by revivals. Dr Broadhead deals gently with those who have tried to find a connection between the three tragedies, but he is clearly not convinced by them, and he is right.

If this review cannot do justice to this book, it may at least have given some indication of its scope, learning, sound judgment, and moderation. To call it a triumph of New Zealand scholarship would be to limit it locally; classical scholars the world over will now be in debt to Dr Broadhead.

University College, London

T. B. L. WEBSTER

POEMS OF A PHYSICIAN. Edward A. Woodward. *Launceston, Foot and Playsted*, no date, pp. 42.

THIS is a collection of amateur verses by the late Dr E. A. Woodward of Grafton, New South Wales. His many interests included the Classical poets, especially Catullus and Horace, and he was fascinated by the game of putting them into English verse. Most of this collection are translations, many of them what the Preface calls 'metrical experiments to see if the

Book Reviews

original metres could be taken across into English while yet making accurate translations'. The poems are clearly experimental, presumably never intended for publication, but written for the pleasure of the author and his friends, and only those who have indulged a like temptation will appreciate the good doctor's random triumphs.

The translator of Latin poetry has three particular problems of technique to solve, in addition to the general difficulty of representing any poet's mode of expression in another language. They arise from the characteristics of Latin which have no satisfactory equivalent in English: quantitative scansion, a flexible word-order, and economy of words.

Many poets have experimented with reproducing the Latin metres in English, and have only succeeded in proving that it cannot be done well. Quantities and their grouping in feet are precise units to work with, like the notes and bars of musical notation, and they create a strictly disciplined line of verse. The English stress accent is too wayward and its feet too flexible to represent the effects of the Latin. The only comparable discipline is rhyme, and a particularly rigorous rhyme-scheme, such as that of the sonnet, is the nearest one can get to the effect of Latin verse in English. Hendecasyllabics come off worst of all. What is one to make of 'Now he limps his way all that unlit journey' as an equivalent of 'qui nunc it per iter tenebricosum'? Both lines have eleven syllables and there the resemblance ends, for the English stresses make quite a different pattern from that of the Latin quantities. Sapphics and Alcaics fare little better, and sometimes worse, as in the last stanza of Horace, *Odes* II, 3. Iambics are possible, since English does have iambic metres, but continuous Alexandrines are intolerable, and it must be the pentameter that represents the senarius.

Something can be done, however, with elegiacs, using iambics and a rhyme in alternate lines, as in the versions of Catullus LXXII and LXXVI. The latter, redolent of Kipling's *If*, is a fair example of Dr Woodward's best:

If there be any joy in telling over
your olden generous deeds and duty done,
if you've not wronged Truth's sanctity, nor cheated
in any pact by Fortune falsely won,
store of delight the slow years hold, Catullus,
from ill-requited love's comparison.

The only Latin line with a close English equivalent, however, is the trochaic septenarius of the *Pervigilium Veneris* and the poem by Tiberianus. Here the translator's 'Locksley Hall' couplets show some feeling for verbal harmonies, as in 'so the gentle west wind speaking melody and movement made', though 'speaking' is not quite the right word either for sense or sound.

The problem of word-order can often be ignored, but may sometimes be met quite simply by a recasting of the syntax. Dr Woodward has a good example of this technique in his version of Lucretius I, where at line 84 the story of Iphigenia is introduced by the ominous name of the place where the tragedy took place: 'Aulide quo pacto . . .' The bold 'Remember Aulis . . .' here is excellent, and it is a pity the translator did not experiment more in this manner instead of clinging so faithfully to the mere syntax of the Latin.

Although the verbal economy of Latin verse cannot easily be matched in English, a translation should at least prune away superfluous words and aim at some kind of conciseness. It was a mistake, for example, to put the

Book Reviews

single-line refrain of the *Pervigilium Veneris* into a couplet, padded out to fill up the metrical space. On the other hand it is worth quoting 'Doom's irrevocable saga' for Propertius's 'Fatorum nulli reuolubile carmen' (IV, 7, 51), as a model of brevity which outdoes even the Latin.

Dr Woodward is perhaps happiest with Propertius and Virgil, and catches something of the note of pathos in each. 'If you with him alone on that lone shore' (*Georgics* IV, 465-6) and 'Ixion's wheel was still in a windless world' (484) are both effective lines in their contexts. For the most part the sense of the Latin is accurately rendered, but there are mistranslations here and there. Horace's famous 'non omnis moriar' does not mean 'I'll not quite be dead', but 'not all of me will die'; Virgil's 'lustrabat' in *Georgics* IV, 519 describes movement, not light; 'cacumina' in Statius, *Silvae*, V, 4, 4 refers to trees, not crags; and in *Pervigilium Veneris* 2 'Vere natus orbis est' means what it says, that the world was born in the Spring.

In a publication designed to do honour to the author of these verses it is disappointing to find some serious editorial carelessness, particularly in the headings to the poems. Catullus LXXVI is wrongly numbered LXXXVI and consequently placed out of order; similarly CIX is miscalled CX. Horace should have the designation 'Odes' with the numbers; and the first passage from Lucretius should have the reference 'I, 1-148'. Also the layout of the text on the pages is somewhat amateurish, and it is awkward for reference that the pages are not numbered. The book does well, however, in perpetuating the memory of the delightful character that Dr Woodward must have been, and it will do well too if it stimulates others to emulate his experiments in the translation of Latin verse.

University of Canterbury

D. A. KIDD

DRYDEN'S "AENEID" AND ITS SEVENTEENTH CENTURY PRE-DECESSORS. L. Proudfoot. *Manchester University Press*, 1960, pp. vii + 279.

THE writing of Dryden's *Aeneid* both created and perfected a tradition. In establishing the norm of the Augustan epic style, Dryden drew—more freely than he acknowledged—on the work of predecessors in translation, whose versions he kept at his elbow. Mr Proudfoot investigates the nature of this debt in some detail, and uses his results to arrive at a just critical estimate of the poem.

The book is in three parts. The first analyses *Aeneid* IV almost line by line, setting alongside Dryden's work passages from the early translators which he appears to have adapted. The second part consists of short essays on these forgotten ancestors—the anonymous author of *Didos Death*, Vicars, Stapylton, Godolphin and Waller, Ogilby, Harrington, Sir Robert Howard, Denham and Lauderdale (the only writer whose aid Dryden openly admits, and that inadequately). The third part consists of a sustained critical essay defining and distinguishing the poetical qualities of the *Aeneid* as an Augustan epic; it is based in large part on the facts established earlier in the book.

The general reader will find this third part most valuable, and it is excellently done. The criticism is sensitive and firm; it not only demonstrates but accounts for Dryden's strengths and weaknesses. Mr Proudfoot is particularly acute in seeing that Dryden read the *Aeneid* as a document with contemporary political implications. The book suffers, however, through its design, which is limited to Virgilian translations. The Augustan

Book Reviews

high style in translation owed as much—or more—to versions from other writers, especially Ovid. From the beginning of the century Ovid gave a model for the closed couplet. Sandys' *Metamorphoses* (not here mentioned) was the first major—though imperfect—attempt at the new style. More important, from the early eighties on, the miscellany translations of Ovid (in which Dryden had a major part) made popular the generalised idiom which was to be perfected (*mutatis mutandis*) in the *Aeneid*. In excluding all classical authors but Virgil, Mr Proudfoot misses some of these connections, and ascribes to Dryden (and to the influence of Virgil) stylistic practices which were common throughout the translations of the age. He is justly severe on Dryden's failure to perceive the poetic universality of the *Aeneid*; but the criticism should be directed to the inadequacy of the general historical imagination of the age, which Dryden did not transcend. And something should surely have been said about Roscommon's theories of translation, and perhaps Killigrew's.

The second part is valuable for the specialist, not merely because of the lack of other published accounts of these obscure books, but because of the soundness of Mr Proudfoot's judgments. In some matters the treatment is not quite complete; there is more to be said about the sundry versions, in manuscript and in print, of Lauderdale's translations, and a little more about the respective shares of Waller and Godolphin in their joint version of 1658. One might wonder, too, whether it was not Denham rather than Godolphin who 'created a new idiom in Virgilian translation' (p. 143), though one cannot be sure until the Hutchinson ms is published in full. The author also misses the influence of Sandys on Stapylton, and Chapman on Vicars, again through excluding non-Virgilian writings.

Only those who have worked in the field know the traps lurking in the kind of detailed investigation undertaken in the first part. Debts between translators are desperately difficult to determine, especially when they are working in the same poetical tradition. I have some reservations of detail on this section, if only because Mr Proudfoot does not print the full evidence. On p. 16 he says, of the opening of Book IV, 'it would seem from a collation . . . that one or other of these [i.e. Ogilby or *Didos Death*] was Dryden's model. I have rejected both, because a greater degree of resemblance is perceptible in Lauderdale and Stapylton.' But, as the rejected passages are not printed, the reader has no chance to decide. A judicious selection of probables and possibles might have helped to convince, and also to demonstrate the ticklish nature of this study. An instance from a translation of Dryden's not touched by Mr Proudfoot may serve as example. In 1684 Creech produced this line when translating from Theocritus' third *Idyll*:

But 'ware the Lybian Ridgling's butting head.

In the ninth *Eclogue*, 1.31, Dryden wrote:

And 'ware the Lybian Ridgils butting head.

But in 1699 Dryden stated that he had not read Creech's *Theocritus*; and it is likely enough that his line was modelled on Lauderdale's version of the *Eclogue*:

. . . take heed

Of that old Ridgling with the Butting Head.

Now Theocritus had certainly read Virgil. But had Lauderdale read Creech? And was Dryden lying? This is quicksilver stuff, and Mr Proudfoot has handled it well; my complaints arise only because he has not extended his study to a wider field.

University of Auckland

S. MUSGROVE

Book Reviews

STUDIES IN WORDS. C. S. Lewis. *Cambridge University Press*, 1960, pp. 240.

READERS of *The Allegory of Love* will remember that Professor Lewis was already interested in words a quarter of a century ago: they may recall, for example, his discussion of the medieval courtly word *danger*. In the Preface to the same book he thanks Dr C. T. Onions for giving him the benefit of 'that best criticism in which all distinction between the literary and the linguistic is resolved'.

This same distinction is resolved, or very nearly so, in Professor Lewis's *Studies in Words*, a book 'based on lectures given at Cambridge during the last few years'. He chooses certain words (including *nature*, *sad*, *wit*, *free*, *sense*, *simple*, *conscience*, *conscious*, and their collaterals in Greek, Latin, and French) 'for the light they throw on ideas and sentiments', and he studies the semantic history of these words in the hope of influencing students of English language and literature:

I am sometimes told that there are people who want a study of literature wholly free from philology; that is, from the love and knowledge of words. Perhaps no such people exist. If they do, they are either crying for the moon or else resolving on a lifetime of persistent and carefully guarded delusion. If we read an old poem with insufficient regard for change in the overtones, and even the dictionary meanings, of words since its date—if, in fact, we are content with whatever effect the words accidentally produce in our modern minds—then of course we do not read the poem the old writer intended. What we get may still be, in our opinion, a poem; but it will be our poem, not his (p. 3).

Professor Lewis lets us down lightly at first by giving us fairly simple notes on some of the semantic phenomena to which he will need to refer in the studies that follow. In particular, he comments on 'the dangerous sense' (*d.s.*) possessed by many words of multiple meaning—dangerous because it is the dominant sense in current usage and therefore the one likely to influence us most, both in and out of season.

After this preliminary skirmishing the author gets down to business with a fifty-page study of the various meanings and interrelationships of the words *natura*, *kind*, and *phusis*. He distinguishes between *phusis* meaning 'sort, character' and *phusis* meaning 'the material world, the created universe' (a sense of the word which passed first to *natura* and then from *natura* to *kind*). He regards the second meaning as the 'dangerous sense': 'we shall go widely astray if we assume that whenever authors use the word *nature* they must be thinking of *nature* (*d.s.*).' He then proceeds to illustrate his point by examples taken from Chaucer, Shakespeare, Pope, and Johnson.

There are a few small things which may worry some readers of this chapter on *nature*. One cause of worry is Professor Lewis's principle, enunciated in his Introduction, that the meaning of a word is insulated by its context: that, if this were not so, communication in words would become impossible. However true this may be in ordinary prose usage, there are obviously many poets who exploit (consciously or unconsciously) the different senses of a word: Pope's complex use of *nature* in *Eloisa to Abelard*, quoted by Professor Lewis on p. 52, is a good example of a poet doing so.

Another cause of mild anxiety is one which the author himself brings to light in his final (and very entertaining) section on "'Nature" in Eighteenth—and Nineteenth—Century Poetry'. Surely, ever since the days of Wordsworth, the dominant, and therefore dangerous, sense of *nature* has been 'the country as opposed to the town'. This is the meaning that most school-

Book Reviews

children still inevitably give to *nature*, unless indeed they learn from their physics teacher or from Pope that they

are but parts of one stupendous whole
Whose body Nature is and God the soul.

It may be true that *nature* in this sense is nothing more than a demotion of *nature* (*d.s.*), but even so it is remote enough from any of the older meanings of *nature* (*d.s.*).

A third minor worry is the statement, made nimbly in passing on p. 27, that the Prayer Book's 'acknowledge and confess' are 'a doublet of synonyms'. It seems at least possible that 'acknowledge' in this phrase means 'admit to oneself, recognize', while 'confess' means 'admit to others (and especially to God or a priest)'. Acknowledgment of sin is one of the preliminaries to confession. Thus in the moral play *Everyman* it is Knowledge (meaning 'self-knowledge resulting in acknowledgment of sin') who has the task of taking Everyman to Confession.

Of the remaining studies, that concerned with *wit* and *ingenium* is perhaps the best, although *sense* and *conscience* are close runners-up. Professor Lewis shows that the Old English meaning of *wit* ('mind, intelligence, good sense') was later influenced by *ingenium* and acquired a new shade of meaning approximating to 'talent, genius'; and how, early in the seventeenth century but increasingly after 1650, a third meaning began to gain ground—the dangerous sense of 'mental agility or the verbal gymnastics which result from it'. Professor Lewis makes it seem to matter vitally that we should not confuse *wit* (old sense), *wit-ingenium*, and *wit* (*d.s.*) in our reading of older authors.

Finally, no reader of this book must skip the last chapter 'At the Fringe of Language', with its observations on the use of emotional language by poets and by men-in-a-temper (including critics), and its dictum that 'The function of criticism . . . is . . . not to discharge our hatred but to expose the grounds for it; not to vilify faults but to diagnose and exhibit them' (p. 227).

It is to be hoped that Professor Lewis's book will point the way to further studies of words in their literary contexts, and so do something to bridge the dangerous (and ridiculous) gulf that still separates Eng. Lang. from Eng. Lit. The only snag is that not many of his students are likely to be as witty or amusing or illuminating as their teacher. Few of us could quote from Plato and from Rider Haggard with equal ease, or produce a comparable harvest of examples from classical, medieval, and modern literature. In short, few of us have Professor Lewis's *ingenium* or his *wit* (*d.s.*).

University of Queensland

A. C. CAWLEY

THE PARLEMENT OF FOULYS. Edited by D. S. Brewer. Nelson's Medieval and Renaissance Library (General Editor: C. S. Lewis). London and Edinburgh, Thomas Nelson, 1960, pp. 168.

UNTIL recently the *Parliament of Fowls*, like the *House of Fame*, was mainly a hunting-ground for scholars in pursuit of historical game (royal marriages in particular). Even now there has not been enough comparative study of Chaucer's three love-visions: the *Book of the Duchess*, *House of Fame*, and *Parliament of Fowls*. Dr Brewer is probably right in believing that the *Parliament* is the best of Chaucer's shorter pieces—the best, that is, if we are thinking of the finished artistry of the whole poem. Yet there is

Book Reviews

nothing in the *Parliament* to equal the emotional climax of the dialogue between the Dreamer and the Man in Black, or the humour of the one-sided conversation between 'Geffrey' and the eagle. The *Parliament* is the perfected love-vision, complete, and self-contained; the *House of Fame* is unfinished, ill-proportioned, and bursting at the seams with all kinds of exciting possibilities (many of which were to be realized in *Troilus and Criseyde* and in the *Canterbury Tales*).

Dr Brewer wisely gives short shrift to the alleged 'historical allusions' in the *Parliament* and concentrates on the things that we really must know something about if we are to understand and enjoy the poem—the social circumstances in which it was written, the literary conventions (and departures from them), the mythology (especially the goddess Nature), the bird lore, the sources, the rhetoric and metre. When we have learnt what he has to tell us about these things, we shall be in a position to follow his lead in exploring the meaning of the poem.

Dr Brewer's interpretation of the *Parliament*, which is in harmony with the findings of Dorothy Everett and J. A. W. Bennett, can be summed up very briefly in his own words (Introduction, p. 14):

This is the essence of the poem—the existence of a variety of apparently contradictory thoughts and attitudes about love (concretely or dramatically described for the most part), which puzzles the poet and yet brings him delight. At least a partial reconciliation is implicit in the figure of Nature, and the poem ends, if still questioningly, on a note of optimism.

This interpretation, worked out in terms of the matter and manner of the poem, is well-founded and satisfying. Nevertheless Dr Brewer would have done no harm—would, indeed, have allowed for a greater variety of response to the poem—if he had pointed out that there are considerable differences of opinion among the commentators on the *Parliament*. Many readers will agree with him that there is a controlling imagination at work unifying the extraordinarily diverse materials of which the poem is made. But it should be noted that as able a critic as Charles Muscatine believes that 'the general presence of irony is not enough to establish a unifying theme'. At least Dr Brewer might have included the work of such scholars and critics as Muscatine, Curry, Preston, Bronson, and Lumiansky in his *Select Bibliography*, which is rather too select as it stands.

Like Professor F. N. Robinson, Dr Brewer has based his text on Cambridge University Library MS. Gg. IV. 27. There are very few important differences between Brewer's text and Robinson's. The present edition keeps the letter-forms and spellings of the manuscript, many of which have been normalized by Robinson. Further, Dr Brewer has exercised his own judgment in preserving or emending the readings of Gg, and occasionally a more satisfactory reading emerges than the one given by Robinson (e.g. 11, 2, 613). Sometimes, however, it is difficult to see the point of an emendation, as for example in 1. 672, where MS. *queen* is replaced by *goddesse*. Neither the Textual Notes nor the explanatory Notes demonstrate why *goddesse* is a better reading, especially in view of the fact that Nature is referred to as a *queene* in 1. 298.

The Notes and the Glossary are very well done, and for good measure there are valuable appendices on Love-visions, the *Dream of Scipio*, the *Teseida*, bk. vii, and Alanus' description of Nature.

The printer and publisher have served Dr Brewer well, for this is a handsomely produced book, like all the other texts in Nelson's Medieval and Renaissance Library.

Book Reviews

A VICTORIAN PUBLISHER: A STUDY OF THE BENTLEY PAPERS.
Royal A. Gettmann. *Cambridge University Press*, 1960, pp. xii + 272 + 4 plates.

DESPITE its title, this book is essentially a study of certain aspects of Victorian publishing, especially novel publishing, exploiting the MS. records of the London publishing house of Bentley, as well as a wide range of secondary material. There is no attempt either to chronicle the activities of Bentley and Son, except briefly in chapter one, or to give a systematic account of the Bentley Papers, although at least a brief description of their extent and physical nature would not have gone amiss. Instead, Professor Gettmann deals in successive chapters with such varied topics as the Standard Novels, 'puffing', author-agreements, costs and returns, 'Nuvvles', the publisher's reader, and finally the three-decker novel. His method by and large is to expound and discuss what is already known, from publishing house histories, for instance, and the work of such scholars as Michael Sadleir and Marjorie Plant, and incorporate with it as much relevant information as possible from the Bentley Papers.

The book therefore functions somewhat unevenly both as a specialized work of reference, and as a more readable study of various problems of nineteenth-century publishing. Perhaps the best chapter from both points of view is on agreements with authors, dealing with the sale of copyright, publishing on joint account and on commission, and the royalty system. Authors discussed here include Richard Barham, W. H. Prescott, Charles Reade, Charles Dickens, James Fenimore Cooper, and Mrs Henry Wood. Elsewhere the several duties of the publisher's reader, extending even to whole-sale revision, are usefully distinguished and illustrated at length from the Bentley Papers. Yet another chapter, on Profit and Loss, deals similarly with such matters as advertising costs and the returns from Bentley's periodical ventures.

It is as a study of problems rather than as a work of reference that other parts of the book are more acceptable. This is especially so when the author is working in those areas of the Bentley Papers that have already been adequately explored. To take Dickens as an extreme case, Gettmann adds little or nothing to Edgar Johnson, whose account he admittedly follows. Nevertheless the material has been carefully reconsidered and fits very properly into a discussion of author-agreements. In a similar way, in the chapter on the three-decker novel, the author is much indebted to such authorities as Michael Sadleir, but makes some valuable points of his own—as on the varied lengths of such works, and on the Mudies' share in its demise.

A more thorough-going attempt to consolidate and build on the work of Sadleir is seen in chapter two, which outlines the competing series of cheap publications, non-fiction and fiction, suddenly springing up in the late 1820's, and gives special attention to those produced by Bentley and his partner Colburn. One gloss on Sadleir is in the form of a two-page table giving detailed costs of production from the Bentley Papers for the first nineteen volumes in the Standard Novels, as listed in *XIX Century Fiction*. Unfortunately its usefulness is limited by a lack of interpretative comment, and because titles are listed without author, most of them without even a mention elsewhere in the book. This leaves the reader to identify the author of say *Hungarian Brothers* or *Canterbury Tales* (A. M. Porter, Harriet and Sophia Lee). This chapter, *not* chapter one as the Preface states, is virtually a reprint of an article in *Studies in Bibliography*, vol. IX (1957).

Book Reviews

This slip prompts the suggestion that chapter one was written in an effort to round off a series of more or less independent studies. Its brevity rules it out as a serious history of the Bentleys from 1829-98, especially as more than half of it is devoted to the partnership from 1829-31, a subject already treated succinctly but very well by Sadleir.

The Introduction too seems to have been an ill-considered afterthought. Dealing with the three decades just before Bentley began, it suffers from a lack of first-hand information, such as is supplied for the rest of the book by the Bentley Papers. For instance, Professor Gettmann begins by drawing a dubious and sweeping distinction between eighteenth and nineteenth-century publishers, and supports his claim that eighteenth-century publishers had comparatively little influence on literature by paraphrasing Ian Watt (*The Rise of the Novel*, p. 55) to the effect that the works which eighteenth-century book-sellers 'directly touched were for the most part encyclopaedias, dictionaries, and other kinds of compilations'. Watt's own statement is much more precise and careful, and certainly does not allow such an inference.

The other function of this book, as a work of reference, is seriously impaired by an index, which, although good as far as it goes, does not make sufficiently available the great variety of useful information contained in the text. In particular, the titles of novels, if listed at all, are given only under author. There is no mention, for instance, of Anne Manning's *Belforest* (1864), to which ten lines are devoted on page 125. Subject headings likewise are too few—the Standard Novels are not indexed as such, although discussed for ten pages in the text.

Room could easily have been made for these additions by eliminating some diffuseness in discussion (as on pages 121 and 184) and even by pruning some of the references in the otherwise excellent foot-notes (see pages 247-8). Elsewhere too the author is more than generous with his space, as when he admits fifty lines from Lockhart's *Life of Scott* (Everyman no. 39) describing the genesis of Constable's *Miscellany*, the prototype of the cheap series. Again, several other passages of only marginal relevance come from an article by the author on 'Meredith as Publisher's Reader'.

In spite of some unevenness in both conception and performance this book is clearly the result of a great amount of scrupulous and well-directed research, and should be useful for different reasons to many readers.

University of Otago

KEITH MASLEN

OF PARADISE AND LIGHT, A STUDY OF VAUGHAN'S 'SILEX SCINTILLANS'. E. C. Pettet, *Cambridge University Press*, 1960, pp. x + 217.

THIS book answers to a long-felt need for a full-length general study of Vaughan that might be recommended to students to supplement Helen White's study in *The Metaphysical Poets* and Miss Mahood's in *Poetry and Humanism*. Pettet has no particular thesis to advance—though anyone who reads the book carefully may well feel that he has been underrating Vaughan—and his method is admirably suited to his intention. In the first section he deals in turn with each of the major influences discernible in Vaughan's work: the Bible, Herbert's poetry, the hermetic philosophy, Nature. In the second he gives detailed analyses of four of the major poems, including, this reviewer was pleased to notice,

Book Reviews

'Regeneration' and 'The Night'. In the third there are further notes on Vaughan's imagery, on the rhetorical impulse in his verse, on his 'music', and on the unity and continuity of *Silex Scintillans*. In this way he has managed to bring into some order the conclusions of many learned articles, and to add some useful original work.

I found the first section somewhat pedestrian. The discussion on the influence of the Bible on Vaughan's work does embody some new and valuable perceptions, I think, but these come dangerously near to being swamped by excessive illustration. However, anything is to be commended which brings home to the students the fact that they can't get far in reading 17th century religious poetry until they know their Bibles pretty well.

The equally full chapter on the influence of Herbert's poetry says nothing that we haven't been told before, and *that* doesn't amount to anything very interesting. The fact is, that in spite of a fantastically large number of verbal echoes and downright thefts, there is an important sense in which it can be said that Herbert's influence on Vaughan has been overrated. The chapter on hermetic influences is an excellent introduction, in fact the most useful there is, since no undergraduate is likely to burrow his way through the periodical articles on this subject, and Elizabeth Holmes's book *Henry Vaughan and the Hermetic Philosophy*, quite aside from the fact that it is now hard to get, is much too unsystematic and indefinite to be really useful. However, this chapter is not altogether unsatisfactory, even granting its obviously limited purpose. The chapters on the Bible and Herbert show signs of close first-hand scrutiny of their subjects; the one on hermetic influence does not: in fact two references each to Paracelsus and Agrippa, one to Boehme, and none to Fludd, add up to a strong indication that Pettet has relied entirely on secondary sources for the material for this chapter. This need not have mattered but for the fact that he achieves an air of authority, arrives with considerable confidence at some wrong conclusions, and implies that all that can be usefully said about hermeticism in Vaughan has already been said. It is just not true that Vaughan's relation to hermeticism has been exhaustively discussed, if only for the reason that no one approaching it through Vaughan has yet offered a coherent statement of what the hermetic philosophy *is*. Nor is it true that Vaughan's best poems are the ones that show a minimum of hermetic influence. Excellent as Pettet's analyses of 'The Night' and 'Regeneration' are, they would have been even better if he had shown some awareness of the way in which hermetic concepts operate in these poems at a deep level. 'The Night' is a marvellous three-dimensional poem, in which hermetic concepts articulate beautifully with the overt orthodox meditation; and the sixth stanza of 'Regeneration'—the central clue to the Vaughan of *Silex Scintillans*—can only be properly interpreted in terms of hermetic mysticism and the hermetic theory of knowledge. The surprising thing is that so intelligent an expositor has held the thread in his hands, and let it fall to the ground unheeded. Pettet notices verbal similarities between the poem and Thomas Vaughan's *Lumen de Lumine*, but simply does not begin to realise the importance of understanding the relevance to the poem of the vision of Thalia, so significantly followed by the disquisition on the unity of the sciences. Not having read Paracelsus, Agrippa or Boehme for himself, Pettet misses the clue. This is not to plead that everyone who writes on Vaughan from now on ought first to immerse himself in hermeticism, but merely that conclusions based solely on secondary material should be tentatively put.

The fact is that hermeticism in Vaughan is a pervasive influence, which

Book Reviews

not only informs the 'thought' of some of his best poems, but shapes his mature poetic. Vaughan is practically virgin territory for close critical analysis. By far the best account of his poetic that I have read is that of Helen O'Grady in her section on Vaughan in *The Dialogue of 'Body' and 'Soul' in the English Religious Lyric* (unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Adelaide, 1959). Practically everything that Miss O'Grady says about Vaughan's characteristic poetic habits can be more plausibly chalked up to hermetic influence than to any other source. For example, Miss O'Grady writes that Vaughan's imagery betrays not so much an awareness of nature or of the realm beyond nature, as of 'a sphere beyond matter in the material world itself'. This very acute statement should be pondered in conjunction with the statement of Boehme that 'Paradise . . . is in the world . . . swallowed up in the Mystery, but it is not altered in itself, it is only withdrawn from our view . . . for if our eyes were opened we should see it'. Further, Miss O'Grady writes that when reading Vaughan her impression is of being bewitched by sleight-of-hand. 'There is something going on, some alchemical transformation of images, that eludes the 'grasp' and raises a defensive wariness in the reader nurtured on twentieth century poetry and criticism.' In fact, this is the experience of all of us in reading Vaughan, except that we have had to wait for Miss O'Grady to formulate it for us. Yet isn't this just the kind of poetic effect we might expect from a man whose twin brother was constantly writing on his own account, or transcribing from others, passages like the following:

But after the spirit has failed through the perishable courses amidst which it is dispersed, it is presently purged from all impurity, and changes into innumerable forms, here into herb and there into stone, or perchance into some extraordinary animal; but now and then into a clod, a pearl, some gem or metal; and sweetly glittering with blushing flames, it passes continually through a myriad changes of colours, and lives always an operator and magus of prodigies, never wearying with the toil thereof but ever young in strength and energy.

Finally, Miss O'Grady writes that 'On the level of sensory images, Vaughan's emphasis is always on the activity, the dynamic quality of impressions. His visual world is constantly moving, changing, a kaleidoscope of light and shadow and dynamic forms.' In fact, there is no other seventeenth century poet whose verse so conjures up a sense of dynamic cosmic energy as does that of Vaughan, and again this is what we might expect. In its 'scientific' aspect of alchemy, hermeticism is above all concerned with *process*; in its more purely philosophical aspect, hermeticism accounts for the created world in terms of emanation and return to source, in terms, that is, of endless cyclic movement. In the hermetic books, the stress is frequently laid on the *energy*, the *working* that goes on in the cosmos: 'God is not idle . . . nay, in the cosmos also there is no idleness anywhere.' If the reader wants another example of an English poet whose verse creates an impression of titanic cosmic energy, let him turn to the Blake of, say, *Vala*, or of the second chapter of the *Book of Los*. And Blake's relation with hermeticism needs not my demonstration.

If Pettet's analyses of two of the four major poems are limited in the way I have indicated, they are nevertheless still very worth-while. In the third section of the book, the chapter on *Vaughan's Music* is excellent: original, perceptive and sensitive.

One quibble which presents itself as being rather more than minor: I wish Pettet had not used the modernised *Muses Library* edition of the poetry. He writes that he has done so 'for several reasons' but does not

Book Reviews

say what they are. This edition is certainly no easier to get hold of than Martin's authoritative text; and it is a bad example to students to use an inferior text when a very good one is generally available. This is particularly regrettable in the case of Vaughan, whose typographical habits are distinctive and sometimes a useful guide to interpretation; regrettable too to pass over Martin's devoted labours of a lifetime in this way.

This book, then, is to be enthusiastically welcomed; but for reasons which I hope are plainly indicated in the foregoing, it must be considered as addressed to university students and their hard-pressed tutors rather than to Vaughan specialists.

University of Adelaide

A. W. RUDRUM

THEMES AND CONVENTIONS OF ELIZABETHAN TRAGEDY. M. C. Bradbrook. *Cambridge University Press*, paper back reprint, 1960, pp. viii + 275.

THIS study, first published in 1935, was written 'as an attempt to discover how an Elizabethan would approach a tragedy by Chapman, Tourneur or Middleton.' It is divided into two parts; the first, a theoretical discussion of the themes and conventions found in the work of the Elizabethan and Jacobean dramatists. Shakespeare is excluded because 'he is so different from his contemporaries, particularly in the matter of characterisation, that it is unfair to judge them by him.' Miss Bradbrook describes Conventions of Presentation and Acting under the headings of locality, costume and stage effects, gesture and delivery, and grouping, and Conventions of Action, or plotting and characterisation. Two chapters are given to the nature of Elizabethan dramatic speech, and the habits of reading, writing, and listening which underlie it. The second part of the book consists of studies of the way in which these conventions are used by Marlowe, Tourneur, Webster, Middleton, and the 'decadent dramatists'—Beaumont and Fletcher, Massinger, Ford, and Shirley.

It should be said at once that the analyses of individual plays and comments on their authors constitute the most valuable section of the book. Miss Bradbrook's estimate of Marlowe's *Edward II*, and her treatment of the relationship between plot and subplot in Middleton's *The Changeling*, provide only two instances of her critical ability. Her discussion of the flexibility of Elizabethan rhetoric and patterned speech remains as stimulating as her investigation of the practice of quotation and borrowing from what amounts to a common stock of tags and phrases. And she establishes, by reference to the whole range of non-Shakespearean tragedy, the need to approach the drama with some awareness and understanding of its particular conventions.

On the other hand, much of the information which she provides must be treated cautiously. Inevitably some of it is out of date; she accepts, for instance, the now discredited tradition of an inner stage closed off with curtains. Some of it is simply wrong; 'There were no attempts at historical accuracy [in costume]', 'The structural use of plot and subplot was abandoned [by Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger]'. The material, particularly in the first three chapters, is overpacked, and insufficiently documented.

A more serious criticism is that she largely ignores differences between public and private theatres and their audiences. ['The private and the common stages could not have been very different, from the ease with

Book Reviews

which they pirated one another's plays']; and she tends to assume that there existed a general stage technique lasting right through the period. Her procedure, in the first half of the book at least, is to make a series of dogmatic assertions and support them by reference to the text of one or two plays. The danger of such a method is illustrated by her description of Elizabethan acting technique. 'With spectators on the stage and in broad daylight . . . to maintain attention it would be necessary to exaggerate movement or statuesqueness, to use inflated delivery and conventional posture . . . the acting was probably nearer to that of the modern political platform or revivalist pulpit than that of the modern stage.' Not only is such a description vague—does the reference to modern politicians and preachers really define a technique at all?—it makes no allowance for differences between Blackfriars and the Red Bull, and for the Elizabethan distinction between the 'stalking-stamping Player that will raise a tempest with his toung' and the actors who could 'appeare to you to be the self same men' they impersonated.

In short, although there is sufficient useful material in the book to justify a popular reprint, Miss Bradbrook's study cannot safely be used as the handbook to the conventions of Elizabethan tragedy which it may seem to be.

University of Otago

C. A. GIBSON

THE ELEMENTS OF DRAMA. J. L. Styan. *Cambridge*, 1960.

THE ESSENTIAL SHAKESPEARE. John Dover Wilson. *Cambridge*, 1932; paperback edition 1960.

WHAT HAPPENS IN HAMLET. John Dover Wilson. *Cambridge*, 1935; paperback edition 1959.

A NONSENSE ANTHOLOGY. Collected by Carolyn Wells. *Dover* paperback, 1958.

In *The Elements of Drama* Mr Styan deals with one aspect only of drama, the practical study of the 'dramatic score', analysing its elements, their blending, and their effect upon the playgoer, from the point of view of both actor and audience. He is concerned to illuminate the text, regarding the dramatist, in Anouilh's phrase, as 'the poet of words—acted, of scenes—set, and of players—performing'.

Deploring the lack of critical terms applicable to a play in the theatre, Mr Styan dodges the difficulty by developing his argument through examples. The book has no real unity, but dissolves into a series of analyses of the words, gestures, staging, and emotional implications of passages in some twenty plays. There are brief references to many more, from *Oedipus* to *The Cherry Orchard*. These discussions, though rather pedestrian in presentation and with overtones of Adult Education lecturing, do bring to bear a new critical apparatus. The result for the armchair reader is frequently illuminating, though some of the suggestions may be commonplace in acting circles.

This is where the value of the book lies. Its richest contribution is the running commentary upon King Lear's first encounter with the disguised Edgar. This, part of the chapter on 'visual and verbal integration', triumphantly justifies Mr Styan's method. Few critics, with the notable exception of Granville Barker, have made this actor's approach. Mr Styan's study will have its place on the drama shelf, but rather in the supplementary handbook class than as comprehensive dramatic criticism.

Book Reviews

With it in the parcel of books for review came also three quality paperbacks, Dover Wilson's *The Essential Shakespeare* and *What Happens in Hamlet*, and an American reissue, *A Nonsense Anthology*. (Their juxtaposition set up a train of thought which had instantly to be rejected!)

Dover Wilson's nutshell biography was the product of his work with the Comedies for the New Cambridge Edition. It may be said to reflect the first ecstasies of his lifelong love affair with the Bard. Warning us against 'the butcher boy of Stratford' who was Sidney Lee's 'secret image of the heart', Dover Wilson sets up his own shrine, warming to his work with rising eloquence. 'Happy passion pulses through the Sonnets'; in *Venus and Adonis* we are 'ravished by the witchery into forgetting the wantonness'; did Shakespeare go to hangings? 'Not often' we are assured,—too bloody. The doings of the years 1592-4 are boldly reconstructed, certainly with the warning that this is 'largely conjectural and likely to be stoutly contested by others'. 'Hamlet's mystery is the mystery of Essex.' The tragedies show the poet toiling up 'the mountain track, which, rising gently from the plain, grows ever narrower', but in this case however did not wind uphill all the way, taking a turn for the better with the Last Plays into the happy 'valley beyond'.

And so on. Every page is starred with biographical or interpretative heresies which are still 'stoutly contested'. *The Essential Shakespeare* is a dangerous little book to be abroad in paper covers: its message, that 'Shakespeare is one of the great moral forces of the world, a human saviour and redeemer', is more likely to promote sentimental misconceptions than true appreciation.

What Happens in Hamlet (1937) is a different matter. This reprint of the 1950 edition includes all the later supplementary material, from which the reader can take warning that Dover Wilson's ideas have indeed been 'stoutly contested'. When this bombshell dropped into the critical arena in 1937, Hamlet studies were still rather pompous, philosophical-romantic, and Bradley-ish. The explosion stimulated a number of scholars to take a new, long look at the play, in terms of the 'words—acted, scenes—set, and players—performing'.

So much has happened in Shakespearean studies since 1937 that it is useful to have the original argument available again. Its value may be summed up in the words Mr Styan used of his own aims, 'to send the reader back to the play with a direction for his understanding is all one could wish for'.

A Nonsense Anthology is mildly amusing, but contains none of this century's fun. At the price, and in paper covers, it is not as good value as more up to date English hardbacks.

Victoria University of Wellington

JOAN STEVENS

ETUDES SUR RIMBAUD. Charles Chadwick. *Paris, Nizet, 1960*, pp. 154.

It is not easy nowadays to say anything new about Rimbaud; but Mr Chadwick does not rehash things already said. And he is particularly interesting on the subject of the *Illuminations*.

He attaches special importance to Rimbaud's early revolt (in *Les premières Communions*) against Christianity 'à cause de sa dureté à l'égard des appétits charnels', and claims that the poet's thought is built largely henceforth on the idea that we must not deride the great name of Venus.

Book Reviews

This in turn gives the young man's anti-Christian urge 'une portée sociale', so that he participates in the anti-bourgeois feeling so common in his century.

I agree with the author in this, but find it harder to accept his argument that there is pity for the unfortunate—including Rimbaud himself—in these two lines of *Les Chercheuses de Poux*:

L'enfant se sent, selon la lenteur des caresses,
Sourdre et mourir sans cesse un désir de pleurer.

It seems to me that these shadowy tears denote precocious sensuality rather than tenderness.

Mr Chadwick is quite sound in his judgment of the revolt in *Le Bateau ivre* and he has some illuminating things to say about the much discussed sonnet, *Voyelles*. He offers a purely psychological and poetic explanation of the colours. Thus 'A noir', he argues, was a natural starting-point, because the vowel A figures in the word 'noir', and also because 'c'est une couleur par laquelle le poète visuel qu'est Rimbaud aime commencer ses premiers poèmes, comme un peintre qui prépare le fond sombre de sa toile avant de superposer d'autres teintes' (the author quotes several examples from other early pieces). The other vowels and colours are then disposed in an order that avoids mechanical repetition of the 'A noir' procedure, and which keeps a good poetic balance in the sonnet. It would be difficult to prove this argument, but it is not one that can easily be denied, and it constitutes a salutary lesson for those who read occultist ideas into a quite simple poem (largely because the word 'alchimie' figures in it).

Mr Chadwick is very forthright about the Verlaine-Rimbaud question. He calls a spade a spade and thus, one hopes, puts an end to the futile attempts that have been made to whitewash an ugly truth—a truth that manifests itself all too plainly in *Une Saison en Enfer* and elsewhere.

There is a long study on the date of composition of the *Illuminations*, the author again taking into account, most laudably, the internal, i.e. poetic, evidence in the texts. He comes down on the side of those who consider the *Illuminations* to be anterior to the *Saison en Enfer*—a conclusion that naturally influences his interpretation of the latter.

Still more interesting is Mr Chadwick's study of the themes in the *Illuminations*. Unfortunately there is not enough space to mention more than a couple of exegeses. He argues, for example, that at the end of both *Après le Déluge* and *Soir historique* we encounter 'le désir impatient du voyant d'anéantir ce monde réel dont il vient d'évoquer . . . la laideur et les déceptions'. If this is true—as I believe it is—one is tempted to wonder whether Rimbaud, when he wrote these two pieces, was still under the spell of Baudelaire to some extent (see the latter's *Rêve parisien*).

Mr Chadwick's explanation of *Une Saison en Enfer* is imaginative and well argued. An important part of his thesis is that after this infernal 'season' Rimbaud 'n'a plus besoin d'un compagnon de route'—Verlaine—'car la leçon qu'il a apprise c'est que ce n'est pas, comme il l'avait cru, par l'amour universel, soit hétérosexuel . . . que l'on peut faire advenir une vie idéale, accessible à tous. Au contraire il est maintenant persuadé que chaque être doit chercher son paradis personnel'.

That gives a positive and constructive character to the *Saison* which too many commentators have failed to see. And it brings out one of Rimbaud's strongest features: his violent and uncompromising individualism.

Book Reviews

MODERN FRENCH POETS ON POETRY. Robert Gibson. *Cambridge University Press*, 1961, pp. xv + 292.

MR GIBSON'S volume comes at an opportune moment, for it supplements the late Prof. Margaret Gilman's *Idea of Poetry in France*, reviewed in AUMLA 14. The latter ranges from the 18th century to Baudelaire inclusive, whereas this new compilation gives a detailed account of French poets' ideas on poetry during the 19th and even in the 20th century.

It takes a different form altogether from Prof. Gilman's book. The editor lets the poets speak for themselves (and in French, which is much more satisfactory), intervening to the extent of linking various currents of poetic thought together and making some cross-references to English poets who have talked about their own art. He is wise to be on his guard when he listens to the poet as critic; for not only is a man's poetic practice often different from his doctrine, but as a self-critic he is apt to be, consciously or otherwise, a self-propagandist.

Mr Gibson writes (p. 15): 'Just as the modern poets' views on their brother poets are often unreliable, so their pronouncements on their own work are not always trustworthy or consistent'; and goes on to quote Baudelaire's public attitude towards *Les Fleurs du Mal* and to contrast it with his statements in other writings and in private letters. It is piquant to find even Valéry, in this respect, convicted of inconsistency out of his own mouth (pp. 18-19). It is interesting also to have Mr Gibson point out that among modern French poets Verlaine was the only one to see the meretricious character of Poe's work, which was taken with such amazing seriousness by poets as perspicacious as Mallarmé and Valéry. Writing to Lepelletier in May 1873 about some projected verses, he says: 'Ce sera très musical, sans puérilités à la Poë; quel naïf que ce malin-là!' (p. 17).

In Part II (*Poetic Ends*) of Mr Gibson's book we find some extravagant 19th century concepts of the poet's mission. Sometimes here Mr Gibson does not need to intervene. Hugo, for example, speaks only too clearly in this extract (p. 25) from *Les Mages*:

Pourquoi donc faites-vous des prêtres
Quand vous en avez parmi vous?
Les esprits conducteurs des êtres
Portent un signe sombre et doux . . .

and so on; the real priests being poets, of course.

During most of the 19th century the poet looked on himself as a pariah, or an exile, shut out from a hostile (bourgeois) society, having only one refuge, one Eden: poetry. The Ivory Tower, as Mr Gibson sees it, disappears only in our own century (p. 43). I would venture to add here that 'integration' and 'engagement' can none the less be as unreal as hermeticism. I mean poetically unreal; I can rarely see any poetry in a politico-sociological argument, however important the argument may be *per se*. François Coppée inadvertently gave us a dreadful warning in this respect when he wrote *La Grève des Forgerons* and thought it was poetry.

The book reaches its most interesting stage in the excerpts in Part II from Baudelaire, Mallarmé, Rimbaud, Claudel and Valéry, where the editor's comments become at times as useful as the texts quoted. My only serious reproach here is that he probably takes Mallarmé's 'mental upheaval' of 1866-70 a little too seriously; being misled perhaps by such critics as M. Charles Mauron, who in his *Introduction à la psychanalyse de Mallarmé* reads the most amazing traces of memories of near-lunacy into perfectly lucid—and artistic—lines and stanzas of *Prose pour des Es-*

Book Reviews

seintes. Nor do I believe that it is mental complications that make Mallarmé difficult. It is, rather, the novelty of his method, in accordance with which he sees the reality of phenomena only as they are reflected in his own mind (a perfectly sound point of view, surely). Communicating one's mental processes is difficult enough even today; and in this domain Mallarmé was a pioneer. . . . These disagreements do not prevent me, however, from finding Mr Gibson's Mallarmé section (pp. 77-93) interesting.

Another very interesting chapter is *The Case for Hugo* (pp. 126-133). Nowadays, when critics all too readily belittle the great Victor, it is good to find, in Mr Gibson's excerpts, so many poets taking quite an opposite view. Thus Leconte de Lisle: 'L'écrivain qui a rendu à notre langue rythmée la vigueur, la souplesse et l'éclat dont elle était déstituée depuis deux siècles'—a judgment which, though it reaches back a century too far, it would be very hard to disprove, whatever reservations one may have about Hugo as a thinker. From here the editor goes on to poets' theories about the purification of poetry, poetic language, artistic transposition, rhyme and rhythm, inspiration, the philosophy of composition. And I must say that all this leaves us with the impression that, whatever their extravagances and idiosyncrasies, 19th century poets did a very good job indeed, forcing an incredulous or indifferent world to realise that poetry is an art, not a hobby that anyone at all can take up if he has enough ink and leisure.

Possibly the main weakness of Mr Gibson's anthology is in the width of its scope. One needs to be a specialist to extract all the sap from certain chapters, and no one can be a specialist in so many fields. But this weakness (if it really is a weakness) is generously redeemed by the wealth of quotations, the clear logic of their arrangement, and the modest but competent and sagacious interpolations made by the editor. This is the sort of book that one will not merely read and put away: it deserves a prominent place among a serious reader's works of reference, and I think it will get it.

Mr Gibson adds a select bibliography of the various authors' works and of books and articles written about them.

Melbourne

A. R. CHISHOLM

JULES SUPERVIELLE. Dorothy S. Blair, Blackwell's Modern Language Studies. Oxford, 1960, pp. xiii + 186.

DR. BLAIR'S monograph is the first full-length study of Supervielle to be published in English and is an important contribution to Supervielle studies. Dr. Blair's main concern in this book is to evaluate the quantity of myth in Supervielle's poetry and prose, though in the course of her investigation she manages to touch on most aspects of Supervielle's work and to make some illuminating comparisons between Supervielle and Maeterlinck, as well as with Lewis Carroll, which show the irreducible differences between their Wonderlands.

After an important biographical chapter, Dr. Blair traces the patterns of images and themes that recur throughout Supervielle's work; images drawn from his South American and European background, images of seas, mountains, clouds, stars; themes of space, time, creation, memory, love, pity, death, the inner journey. There is an excellent chapter on Supervielle's kinship with the world without and his 'bestiary': and from all this emerges a description of the contents of Supervielle's poetic world and a demonstration of how in his poetry he 'humanises' the world. This method of breaking poems up into their main images has

Book Reviews

its dangers; images can only really operate in their full power if they are restored back to the total structure which every poem should be. Dr. Blair does not always avoid the dangers inherent in her method.

There is an excellent section on Supervielle's language which traces the elimination of neologisms, technical terms, pedantic and precious words, the abuse of the double entendre and monotonously repetitious abstract words, to the slow maturing of an austere simplicity of vocabulary. The discussion of Supervielle's relation to the Surrealists is well done, and there are some helpful comparisons between Supervielle and Claudel and Rilke and a brilliant chapter discussing Supervielle's adulation of Francis Thompson (another case of mistaken identity) and probing his generous but confused sense of affinity with that very uneven English poet.

Dr. Blair is inclined to see Supervielle's preoccupation with limbs, bones, nerves ('l'univers obscur qui forme notre corps') as stemming to a certain extent from his own unusual physical stature. This may well be so, but Supervielle's poems on the body are essentially metaphysical poems, and in his work he deals poetically with such themes as the non-objectivity of the body, the relation between the body and the self, and so on. Not to emphasise this is to deprive a part of Supervielle's work of an important dimension.

Throughout this book Dr Blair stresses the 'humanising' quality of Supervielle's poetry, perhaps at the expense of a certain critical astringency, but never finally formulates the point that it is infused with the values of natural piety and that this is what finally helps to redeem it from the charge of fanciful whimsicality or 'cosy charm' that so often threatens it.

University of Tasmania

VIVIAN SMITH

THE IMAGE IN THE MODERN FRENCH NOVEL. Stephen Ullmann. *Cambridge University Press*, 1960, pp. viii + 315.

READERS of *Style in the French Novel* will welcome this new volume by Professor Ullmann, which, as he tells us in his preface, is a sequel to the earlier work. In its turn a detailed study of certain Proustian metaphors, notably those related to the concept of time, is promised and will be awaited no less eagerly than was the present book.

The longest chapter (115pp.) is devoted to an examination of the 'metaphorical texture' of *Du côté de chez Swann*; another (98pp.) treats of 'the development of Gide's imagery'; there is a 61-page essay on 'the two styles of Camus', and one of 25 pages on 'the symbol of the sea in *le Grand Meaulnes*'.

The chapter on Gide is particularly cogent. Among other things, we are shown the importance of *Isabelle* in the evolution of Gide's imagery, which reaches its high-water mark in *Les Faux-Monnayeurs*. Whatever we may think of the form of the latter work, and even if we share Henri Peyre's dislike for the notion of 'a novel about a novelist writing a novel about a novelist trying to write a novel', we are bound to agree with Professor Ullmann that stylistically *Les Faux-Monnayeurs* shows Gide at the height of his artistic powers.

In the essay on Alain-Fournier it is good to see Professor Ullmann making the point that 'the recurrence of an image is not necessarily a symptom of deep-seated emotional involvement: it may simply be due to the appropriateness and expressive force of the image itself'.

It would appear niggling and ungracious to take the author up on

Book Reviews

one or two points of detail in a work of such all-round excellence; but to specify these will at least serve the purpose of demonstrating how little there is to find fault with in this book. On Page 117 Professor Ullmann remarks that in *Le Grand Meaulnes* 'there are (. . .) a number of visual images, based on similarities in external appearance', and he goes on to say that 'some of them have an amusing tone'. The second of the two examples cited in support of this statement ('la joyeuse voiturée avec sa carapace de parapluies ouverts') bears it out well enough; but surely there is nothing amusing, or for that matter novel, about the other example: 'quelques vieilles paysannes avec de rondes figures ridées comme des pommes'. Then, with regard to Proust (p. 145), no doubt he was alive to the danger implicit in the use of mechanical terms to describe the workings of the mind; but the evidence adduced is hardly sufficient to prove the point.

To turn now from trivia and to sum up, Professor Ullmann has brilliantly demonstrated, with admirable lucidity and readability (qualities sometimes unfortunately missing from works of stylistic analysis), how much can be learned about a creative writer from a systematic study of his image patterns.

Australian National University

D. P. SCALES

NOVALIS: SCHRIFTEN. Edited by Paul Kluckhohn and Richard Samuel (W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart). Erster band — Das dichterische Werk (1960).

NOVALIS, 'the marvellous boy', has not ceased to fascinate the German mind and imagination in this century, and as the crowning achievement of decades of editorial work, Kluckhohn and Samuel issued their edition of the works in 1929. This edition is now out of print, and further critical labours and the discovery of fresh material have made a new edition desirable. It was extremely good news when we heard that the old editors had undertaken this task. The first volume, the poetic works, has now appeared; it is to be followed by two volumes of the philosophical writings, and one of personalia—letters, diaries, etc., together with personal statements of contemporaries. The names of the editors guarantee the ripest and most careful scholarship; and though Kluckhohn's death in 1957 was a serious loss, the joint work had prospered so well that Professor Samuel could proceed confidently. It is an additional triumph that it could be carried out so successfully from Melbourne.

The first volume is larger than the corresponding one in the 1929 edition, in respect to critical information as well as original documents. Along with the texts of the prose and verse, that include many fragments and plans, there is a very full bibliography of publications on Novalis that makes the edition an account of the present state of interpretation and research and a basis for all future critical study. Important textual investigations such as those of Heinz Ritter on the *Hymnen an die Nacht* and the *Geistliche Lieder* are incorporated with due acknowledgement; information on variant readings, erasures, additions in the MSS is clearly conveyed. We are also most usefully told where MSS are, and which have been lost—valuable MSS were lost in the upheavals of the war, and we owe a particular debt to the editors since they promoted researches such as that of Samuel's pupil Walter Creydt (himself a victim of the times), whose copy of Novalis's earliest MSS survives,

Book Reviews

though the originals have been lost. Most meticulous study has made it possible to correct the dating of some of the material.

Apart from the valuable and economical notes, there are introductions to the various works (*Die Lehrlinge zu Sais*, the *Hymnen* and *Geistliche Lieder*, *Ofterdingen*, the *Vermischte Gedichte*) which indicate with admirable terseness origins, literary and philosophical connexions, etc. One might make particular mention of the new material in the early poems (before 1791) and the excellent introduction to this section. Few of these poems are valuable in themselves, but they give most illuminating insight into the influences that shaped Novalis's imagination and expression. While we are struck by the reminiscences of Rococo and sentimental Aufklärung poetry, by the curious reconciliation of Klopstock and Wieland, we are equally impressed by the absence of any Sturm and Drang note, and indeed the absence of Goethe! This throws light on the later repudiation of *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*, and provokes anew the paradoxical thought that Goethe was an aberrant of the 'Goethezeit'.

The edition raises very few critical doubts. Orthography and punctuation have, it is explained, been modernised, except in a few cases (the *Hymnen an die Nacht*, of which the MS is transcribed alongside the printed version of the *Athenäum*). The Notes indicate the original punctuation. Would it not have been wiser to give the original punctuation, especially in the case of the early poems? Punctuation (or its absence) is very revealing, as we know with Goethe's early poems. It may be ungenerous to cavil at the general introduction of Paul Kluckhohn, as it is the final summing up of a life-time of work on Novalis. As biography it is excellent and necessary. But the separate introductions to the different sections repeat, more fully, what is said here about influences and origins; and in general perhaps it was not necessary in an edition of the works to attempt to interpret.

We know that there are important discoveries to be incorporated in the later volumes and we look forward to them with lively expectation. We are already deeply in debt to the editors.

University of Birmingham

ROY PASCAL

SCHILLER: BICENTENARY LECTURES. Edited by F. Norman, University of London, Institute of Germanic Languages and Literature. Distributed by International Booksellers Ltd., London, 1960. pp. ix + 168.

SCHILLER, it seems, cannot be taken for granted. No good *Germanist* would want to, not, at least, in the sense of Schiller's reputation and meaning being finally settled. A feature of this book, however, is the note of justification which, like Goethe's susceptible ancestor, 'spukt so hin und wieder'. Fifty-five years ago Otto Müller (in the *Marbacher Schillerbuch*) rang in the celebrations as follows: '... dass trotz allem Wandel der Zeiten Schillers Geist seine Kraft ... bewahrt hat, dass er unter uns lebendig ist und bleibt'. Here, however, we find Edna Purdie asserting cautiously, 'None I think can deny that, in one way or another, Schiller ... has remained alive'. At the other end of the book W. Witte records the condescending attitude of various English critics to the 1958 performances of *Maria Stuart* and concludes hopefully '... this ... testifies to the enduring vitality of the work ... a play which ... can still spark off controversy'.

Between these 'general' essays are ranged four detailed studies: E. L. Stahl's tracing of Schiller's possible influence on *Faust*, Elizabeth M. Wil-

Book Reviews

kinson's reflections after translating *Letters on the Aesthetic Education of Man*, Benno von Wiese on Schiller as a philosopher of history, and Ilse Appelbaum-Graham on the structure of personality in Schiller's tragic poetry. Flanked by the artillery already observed, it is obviously a brilliant covering force which takes up the defence.

Edna Purdie does not try for any particular depth. She picks three typical kinds of scene and comments on their function. This is familiar ground, although Professor Purdie distinguishes interestingly between the rational argument in Tell's monologue and the 'march of destiny' in the monologues of Wallenstein, Isabella and Don Cesar. This introduces an account of Schiller's concern with the nature of man—rather than with freedom—followed by a *leitmotif* of the whole book: a fresh consideration of the *Ästhetischen Briefe*. The conclusion provides a corrective to the picture of Schiller as 'ethical optimist': Professor Purdie shows how Schiller's visionaries are destroyed before finding that balance which would make them complete men.

We are left with a reminder that while Schiller envisaged a positive solution—man *can* become good through selflessness—he knew that life in this world, the *only* world for Schiller, was an uncertain affair.

While Miss Purdie stays firmly on the ground E. L. Stahl takes off early in his piece and stays resolutely aloft. While admiring Stahl's impeccable method in tracking possible (and apparently very probable) influences on *Faust* it is difficult to have much patience with his discussion of *Streben*, which is the core of the essay. He asserts that long before the end ('*Wer immer strebend sich bemüht . . .*') 'the inadequacy of "Streben" as a means to achieve salvation has been presented . . . "Streben" is never for Goethe an end in itself . . . it finds . . . consummation with surcease beyond this world'.

Stahl fairly stresses Schiller's *Diesseitigkeit* but over-emphasises Goethe's transcendentalism, at least where *Faust* is concerned: he gives a detailed commentary on the concept of *reine Tätigkeit* without, however, telling us what it *is*—'. . . intuition of a realm where activity proceeds . . . with supreme transcendental exclusiveness "von innen"'. That activity Fichte called "nicht-objektive, mithin reine Tätigkeit . . .". In an essay of this kind the temptation to use the rich philosophical vocabulary of German is seductive. The trouble is, however, that one can often 'feel' these concepts without being able to express them in the cold prose of common English. And, by the way, *Faust* has scarcely taken on his 'modern' significance because his activity can only find consummation in realms which can scarcely be discussed in tangible terms.

But these considerations, like much of Professor Stahl's brilliantly provocative essay, lead away from Schiller. Dr Wilkinson's thoughts on the *Ästhetischen Briefe* bring us back very firmly. There can be few scholars as capable simultaneously of profundity, wit and downright common sense as Dr Wilkinson. She avoids that danger central to any specialist contributing to a memorial volume: the tendency to paint one's own two inches of ivory with so fine a brush as to show little relationship to the picture as a whole. Dr Wilkinson rarely moves far from the chosen work yet places it in its time, shows its relevance to us, and discusses the state of the German language at the end of the eighteenth century. The interpretative commentary abounds in wisdom: 'What Schiller does . . . is what many of the great eighteenth-century writers do: he works in a tradition and at the same time profoundly modifies it . . . it is not his aim to gain power through words . . . but to bring into the daylight of psychological understanding things which have a metaphysical sound . . . If . . . Schiller's . . .

Book Reviews

indiscriminate use of . . . eight . . . names for the Godhead does . . . go back to theological polemics . . . it also . . . looks forward . . . to the time when men shall realise that . . . what they thus variously name is One and the Same . . . 'das alte Wahre' . . . is here 'angefasst'—but it is, as Goethe said it should be, "noch einmal gedacht".

Professor von Wiese lifts Schiller out of the aura of Enlightenment surrounding his reputation as a historian. He seems to have little patience with the historian Schiller who defined the 'philosophical mind' in highly subjective terms. He soon settles to his main concern, however: Schiller as historian of Fallen Man who took his fate into his own hands. For Schiller's view of history steadily grew darker: *Über das Erhabene* is aptly quoted,—'The world as an historical object is . . . the conflict of the forces of nature among themselves and with the freedom of man, . . . history tells . . . the outcome . . .'

The most fascinating part of this essay comes when Wiese shows how the dramatist, who instinctively saw deep into men, helped the moralising historian who in the *Abfall der Niederlande* set out to paint things in black and white: Schiller is most convincing in the historical portrait, where 'the great . . . personalities become generalised individuals, . . . simultaneously good and evil'. Wiese is less happy discussing Schiller's application of Kant's historical categories. But he breathes out palpably on settling down to the personalities in *Geschichte des dreissigjährigen Kriegs*, emphasising his conviction that Schiller's optimism gave way more and more to a view of history as 'a complex reality which transcends any simple dualism . . . even of good and evil'.

Although Dr Appelbaum-Graham apologises for being unable to present her matter in full, she gives the impression of great detail. Having emphasised that Schiller's tragedy develops around central pairs of characters, she examines the imagery associated with these. Correspondences of imagery and suppression in one figure of what is given free vent in the other lead her to establish close contact between the 'paired' characters. Neither is self-sufficient: 'Each partner realises his . . . potential as he honours the life of the other, helping it to realise itself.' Dr Appelbaum-Graham finds that Schiller's second basic principle is the creation of single figures—Mortimer and Gräfin Terzky are examples—who embody one fateful trait of the tragic protagonist. She justifies this technique of 'externalisation' by reference to the sixth *Ästhetischen Brief* in which Greek humanity is compared with modern man and the fragmentation of the modern age is exposed.

It will be evident that this essay grapples with many points fundamental to dramatic art and the creative process *per se*. Some readers may not like the occasionally rather precious way in which Dr Appelbaum-Graham combs the texts in support of her views. They may also not approve of the slightly aggressive tone in which she sometimes seems to claim exclusive rights for her idol in this or that. There are no value judgments on the actual clarity of the technique described. But Dr Appelbaum-Graham produces chapter and verse for her assertions. And at least one reader is refreshed by her attention to detail, awareness of the workings of the poet's mind, and belief that he actually *knew* what he was doing.

In Professor Witte's reflections on Schiller's bicentenary the pressure relaxes. This is an amiable *causerie* in which Schiller's modernity is tested and not found wanting. Witte does not hesitate to move off the main road of his thought: Thomas Mann, Lukács, Dylan Thomas and Ingeborg Bachmann appear unembarrassed in the company of Burns, Spender and Ken-

Book Reviews

neth Tynan. Another well-known passage in the *Asthetischen Briefe* is examined—'beauty yields no results either in the . . . intellect or . . . the will'—and Witte concludes with a reminder of Schiller's conviction that aesthetic culture may help men to bring to the daily round that mood of generosity attained in the contemplation of great art. He does indeed draw back at the last and decides that one cannot assent to Schiller's idea without further ado. 'In such a case,' he says provocatively, 'assent or dissent becomes a matter of choice, . . . an act of faith, . . . faith has been described as the substance of things hoped for.'

This volume covers a good deal of ground in content and mood. It is interesting to reflect on how the various techniques and approaches complement each other: Stahl—Purdie, Witte—Appelbaum—Graham, and so on. These scholars show in Schiller and demonstrate the influence in themselves of most of the essential features in Germany's national poet, which are seen to be as alive as ever on his two hundredth birthday. This book should contribute something towards removing the 'national' limitation. It deserves to do so, but as Hofmannsthal said, 'die Aufnahme, die Anteilnahme der Zeitgenossen ist alles.'

University of New England

BRIAN COGHLAN

HUGO VON HOFMANNSTHAL. Edgar Hederer. *Frankfurt/Main, S. Fischer Verlag*, 1960, pp. 368.

THE title betrays nothing. Its lapidary brevity betokens comprehensiveness. Or is this wishful thinking?—Whenever the name appears in a publisher's list hopes rise that this might at last be the full, objective study, vision unimpaired by personal recollection or apostolate. Great names have been linked with Hofmannsthal: Walter Brecht, Curtius, Nadler, Alewyn. Leading creative figures have interpreted him: Schröder, Borchardt, Wassermann, Mell, Carl Burckhardt. He has been honoured for two generations by such representatives of the higher journalism as Rychner and Haas. Yet the only full-length study, and it appeared nearly a quarter of a century ago, was a brave plunge into *Prä-existenz* by Karl Naef, a dark horse and apparently a one-work man. This has been *faute de mieux* the stand-by of generations of students, mostly reluctant, for it is written in a gratuitously recondite style, its tendency is determinedly abstract and the coruscating, strangely shifting image of Hofmannsthal is virtually lost in the process. One would never belittle its service to Hofmannsthal, at a time, moreover, when he was marked down for *totschweigen* or nordic fire. But it set a bad fashion in throwing a veil of obscurity over one who wrote *Jedermann*, *Maria Theresia*, *Der Schwierige* and *Wert und Ehre deutscher Sprache* as well as *Ad me ipsum*, *Andreas* and *Der Turm*.

For years there have been hopes that Alewyn would publish the critical study which has been in the making, according to legend, for twenty-five years or thereabouts. *Über Hugo von Hofmannsthal* (Göttingen, 1958) is the distillation of Alewyn's labours to date,—essays on aspects of Hofmannsthal published in scattered journals from the early thirties onwards. His foreword indicates that this is his final word. One hopes that public encouragement (never lacking hitherto) will constrain him to change his mind.

We are thus faced with a curious situation. The complete edition (see AUMLA no. 14, pp. 94-7) allows us to see Hofmannsthal in a new light. This alone limits the usefulness of Naef's book today. Yet while during

Book Reviews

recent years there has been no shortage of specialised studies, no large-scale work on the whole Hofmannsthal has appeared. There is therefore no widely familiar image of Hofmannsthal comparable with those of Mann, Rilke or Brecht. Works like Walter Jens, *Hofmannsthal und die Griechen* and William Rey, *Der Turm* (in *Das Deutsche Drama*, ed. B. v. Wiese, vol. 2, Düsseldorf, 1958), are invaluable but cannot assume in their readers the kind of background which can be taken for granted by, say, Erich Heller in *The Ironic German*.

Hederer's work, therefore, cannot be regarded as 'another' book on Hofmannsthal. Because of its lonely position uniquely severe demands will be made of it. Let us then be unequivocal: it is in some important respects a disappointment, yet there are beautiful things in it, even though Hederer's principle of selection is often unduly personal, and his spacious account of some works (e.g. the fragmentary *Semiramis*) contrasts oddly with the relatively scanty treatment of *Jedermann*, *Das Salzburger Grosse Welttheater* and *Der Turm*. Several obstacles lie in wait for the 'compleat biographer' of Hofmannsthal. Hofmannsthal was a technical artist of a high order whose attention to the actual art of his work is legendary: his smoothly moulded surfaces concealed (notably after 1900) feats of sheer poetic artistry. And then: his roots lie deep in what Broch called 'a vast ellipse of landscape which, rich in heroic culture and heroic nature, stretching from northern Italy to southern Bohemia and encompassing the Austrian Alps, has its focuses in Venice and Vienna.' The multifarious forces described in *Osterreichische Bibliothek* (1915) were always at work in himself. Raimund, Grillparzer, Maria Theresia and Joseph II. Jesuit drama, Charles of Lorraine on the Kahlenberg, the plays of the Saltshippers' Guild at Lauffen...—and then—Novalis ('zu dem mich immer ein tiefbrüderliches Gefühl gebunden hat'), *Egmont*, and the drive of Strauss and Reinhardt. . . These examples, ranging far in time and space, give some small idea of the web and woof of Hofmannsthal's constitution. This, moreover, ignores forces outside *Germania*: Calderon, Byzantium, Claudel and Hugo, D'Annunzio, Shakespeare. One might ask with Goethe: 'Was ist denn an dem ganzen Wicht original zu nennen?'—And difficulties are indeed only beginning when one gropes a way into the originality of Hofmannsthal himself, who was at least as complex as most of his mentors and inspirations.

On top of this comes the fact that Hofmannsthal became a *Kulturpolitiker*, a *Praeceptor Austriae* and architect of a united Europe. As a politically conscious artist he is, to name only one feature, part of a stream of historical thought in the Habsburg Empire in which are such assorted currents as Seipel and Renner, Popovici, Francis Ferdinand and his ill-fated predecessor Crown Prince Rudolf, Schwarzenberg and Bauer, Redlich and (from across the border) Naumann.

It would be absurd to lay down a syllabus for Hederer and demand that he keep to it. But a comprehensive study of Hofmannsthal should take these things into account even though the importance given to them will vary from one critic to another. But from the start Hederer limits his effectiveness by writing as an apostle, trying to convey a sense of his own immediate experience of Hofmannsthal. Here we come to the next difficulty, one not peculiar to Hofmannsthal although it tends to apply to him with peculiar intensity. There is something in his style, in his mixture of aphorism, concealed allusion and alliteration, haunting and complex rhythms, which can insidiously affect the style of those who write about him, 'insidiously' because these accoutrements without Hofmannsthal behind them will often yield an effect which is epigonic, vague and pretentious.

Hederer is not altogether free from this. In his hands this style sometimes takes on an irritatingly heightened quality, *geklügelt* and not a little tortured. It gives a peculiarly exclusive impression—of the critic-initiate in communion with the master (in the present tense too) and passing on a breath of his delight to the men outside who grub along with their footnotes, first versions, influences, etc. Read in cold blood this strikes the most sympathetic critic as somewhat forced: there is a constant striving for the memorable phrase, the sequence laden with overtone and reminiscence—which every brother-initiate who knows his *Turm* and *Bergwerk*, *Andreas* or *Schrifttum als Geistiger Raum der Nation* will recognise. At its worst this creates a fog of mysticism, rolling steadily down to the depths of bad Wagner: “Erst ist es Bezauberung. Ein Träumer fühlt sich in der Weltmitte. Er nimmt teil an einer Verabredung, die durch alle Wesen reicht. Worte stehen dafür auf. Erinnernd und vorwissend weiss er die Welt.” It follows logically that few critical yardsticks are applied save purely subjective ones: this is *blass*, that is slight. . . Hederer does mention such manifestations of the *Zeitgeist* as Habsburg Austria, the war, Hitlerism, but there is little effort to ‘set’ Hofmannsthal in social, political or cultural contexts. Opinions differ widely as to the relative importance of the social and political elements: neglect of Hofmannsthal’s cultural environment is harder to forgive.

There are few conclusions and no comparisons with other writers. There is little discussion of, for example, Hofmannsthal’s virtues or vices as a playwright in the theatre, although his determination to make a mark there is mentioned. There is no discussion of the theatrical qualities of such a *tour de force* as *Jedermann* or the comparable forces at work in *Der Turm*. And so the list could go on. It goes almost without saying that there is no index. Clearly none is needed: there are no references to other critics and currents. Any ‘apparatus’, it seems, is out of place in the presence of the idol. The mission seems to be to ‘convey’ the spirit of Hofmannsthal in as antiseptic a way as possible.

One might retort that the book is not meant as a ‘learned’ critical biography, that it is an essay in *belles-lettres*, intended for the interested layman. One can only say that Hederer makes great demands on him: to receive anything like the full impact one must have Hofmannsthal’s work at one’s finger-tips. But this was hardly the main intention: consider only Hederer’s academic standing in Munich and throughout the world of *Germanistik*.

There are, however, fine episodes in the book when one feels that Hederer rivals Wiese in what Martini calls ‘Meisterschaft des beschreibend und deutend zusammenfassenden Verstehens’. (*Deutsche Literatur des bürgerlichen Realismus*, DVJ, 4/1960, p. 614). Particularly impressive are the sections devoted to *Der Unbestechliche* and *Xenodoxus*. Only slightly less successful is the annotated plot-telling of *Der Schwierige*, and most Hofmannsthalianes are familiar with the painful gap between *experience* of this drama and the ability to translate evanescent yet abiding impressions into language.

Reluctantly, therefore, one must say that this harvest from years of affectionate and discriminating study of Hofmannsthal is only a partial success. Its many *aperçus*, Hederer’s striking way of taking the measure of a work in a few lines—such things remain in the memory. Sooner or later, however, someone must settle to the task of depicting the whole Hofmannsthal, habitat, origins, influences, development, contradictions, and all. One hopes that perhaps Rey will devote to the entire work of Hofmannsthal the perspective and detailed grace which he has given to the

Book Reviews

Greek dramas and *Der Turm*. And another encouraging assault must be made on Alewyn's conscience.

University of New England

BRIAN COGHLAN

KRITISCHE FRIEDRICH-SCHLEGEL-AUSGABE, ed. by Ernst Behler. Vol. XI: *Wissenschaft der Europäischen Literatur*. Vorlesungen, Aufsätze und Fragmente aus der Zeit von 1795-1804, ed. by E. Behler (LVI & 390 pp.); vol. IV: *Ansichten und Ideen von der christlichen Kunst* (LVI & 272 pp. and 3 illustrations) ed. by Hans Eichner,—Schöningh, München & Thomas, Zürich, 1958 and 1959.

GEORG FORSTERS WERKE. SAMTLICHE SCHRIFTEN, TAGE-
BUCHER, BRIEFE. Vol. IX: *Ansichten vom Niederrhein, von Brabant, Flandern, Holland, England und Frankreich im April, Mai und Junius 1790*, ed. by Gerhard Steiner (452 pp. 8 illustrations and 1 map)—Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1958.

THE first volumes of these two important critical editions of the works of two important writers of the 'Age of Goethe' have appeared and attention to them should be drawn however briefly. The entire works of both these writers are almost inaccessible to-day. The last collected edition of Friedrich Schlegel's works appeared in 1846 (15 vols.) and was based upon the author's own edition of 1822-1825 which omitted important works of his earlier period no longer commensurable with his later beliefs; in addition the works in the authorised edition were so much altered by the author that in many cases they had lost their original character. The last edition of Forster's collected works appeared in 1843 edited by Gervinus in 9 volumes.

Both Georg Forster (1754-1794) and Friedrich Schlegel (1772-1829) have much in common: both were *littérateurs* who lived or tried to live on the income derived from their writings; both were brilliant stylists; both were revolutionaries affected deeply by the French Revolution; Forster championed its ideas until his death; Schlegel until the break-up of the early Romantic School in 1801 after which he became reactionary in outlook and, in 1808, converted to Roman Catholicism; both were disseminators of new ideas, were profoundly learned, both led an unhappy life and did not fit in with established society (although Schlegel tried hard to come to terms with the society of the Habsburg monarchy in the age of Metternich). On the other hand there are important differences between the two writers. Forster remained a man of the Enlightenment, Schlegel was the arch-Romanticist. Yet Friedrich Schlegel was the first to carry Forster's fame abroad, in the teeth of Schiller's contemptuous lines in the *Xenien* and in intentional defiance of them. It was Schlegel in his essay on Georg Forster of 1797 who recognised in him the first German 'social writer', a writer, moreover, who combined French elegance of style and popularity of presentation with English public spirit and German depth of feeling.

Dr Behler's edition is divided into two sections. The first (10 vols.) will contain all the works which appeared in print during the author's life-time; their texts are based on the first prints with variants, changes and additions in later prints being noted in the apparatus. The second section (12 vols.) will contain Schlegel's left papers most of them unpublished, in particular many thousands of aphorisms (over 2000 pertaining to poetry and literature were edited by Hans Eichner as *F. Schlegel. Literary Notebooks 1797-1801*,

London 1957). According to Dr Behler the *Nachlass* is of equal if not superior importance to the published works.

Both volumes which have now been published belong to Schlegel's post-Early Romantic period; they mark the transition from the early to the later Schlegel. Both were conceived in Paris where he went in 1802 to escape his creditors and to study mediaeval and oriental literature and manuscripts in the *Bibliothèque Nationale*. Both were occasioned by the meeting, of the greatest importance for Schlegel's development, with the brothers Boisseree, young merchants from Cologne who had taken an ardent interest in mediaeval German art. They asked Schlegel to lecture to them privately on the History of European Literature. The brothers' lecture notes on this subject form the main body of the volume. Their importance is three-fold: Schlegel developed under the impression of the *Kapitale des Universums* an idea of the intellectual unity of Europe which appears very modern, indeed: the nucleus of this unity was to be the closest co-operation between France and Germany; he further developed a 'genetic' view of literary history which embraces, under the term of literature, an encyclopedic and historical treatment of all aspects of cultural life of the different nations according to the principle of the European idea. Thirdly, he treated in the actual lectures—the last eight of which are unfortunately lost—ancient, mediaeval and modern 'literature' as a closely interrelated process.

Dr Behler's volume is a model of textual criticism and of literary interpretation. In particular the commentary (pp. 267-367), strengthened by an index of subject-matter, relates every aspect of these lectures to Schlegel's previous and later views and constitutes a history of learning of the time.

Professor Eichner (of Kingston, Canada) collects, under the title which Schlegel himself designated for vol. 6 of his *Sämtliche Werke* in 1823, his published essays on fine arts. Again under the influence of the Boisserees he studied the collections of the Louvre and of Lucien Bonaparte, later of the Netherlands and the German regions of the Lower Rhine. The result was published in the periodical 'Europa' as *Gemäldebeschreibungen* in 1803-4. The brothers Boisserees also drew Schlegel's attention to Gothic architecture in Paris, and together with them he travelled through northern France and Belgium to Cologne in 1804. The result was the publication of *Reisebriefe* in 1806, later entitled *Outlines of Gothic Architecture*. These two works were of the utmost importance as they established the Romantic view of art. Schlegel's particular contribution to the history of art was his perfection of a special literary genre, the description of works of art. He also discovered and extolled the value of pre-Raphaelite Italian art and German mediaeval art before Dürer, thus going much farther than the early Romantics who saw the culmination of mediaeval art in Raphael and Dürer. Furthermore, the *Reisebriefe* finally established the preponderance in the Romantic mind of Gothic architecture; they are in fact the first scholarly treatise on Gothic architecture, on the one hand full of imperfections and errors, on the other rich with interesting and understanding observations. Schlegel did more than merely observe historical phenomena; he felt he was entrusted with a mission. Defining as the aim of all art the recapturing of the Divine in man—and the divine at this period became identical with the Christian—he appealed to contemporary artists to go back to the simplicity, honesty and piety of pre-Raphaelite and pre-Dürer mediaeval artists and to work in their spirit. Thus Schlegel became the initiator of the German Nazarene and the English pre-Raphaelite schools, and of the Gothic revival in the nineteenth century. The later

Book Reviews

essays deal mainly with the German Nazarene school.

Professor Eichner presents the texts of these influential essays by going back to the first prints and giving extensive later additions in brackets, variants and smaller textual changes in notes under the respective pages. Unfortunately there is no commentary such as Dr Behler provided for his volume. The excellent introduction, however, gives the essentials of Schlegel's view of art, their genesis and their later deterioration into an obscure if not obscurantist mysticism.

The contents of Professor Eichner's volume have a direct bearing on the main work of Georg Forster's, the *Ansichten vom Niederrhein*, for Forster was in many respects a predecessor of Schlegel's. The *Ansichten* are a travel report like Schlegel's *Reisebriefe*; moreover Forster had almost covered the same route in 1790 which Schlegel covered in reverse in 1804. Forster like Schlegel paid much attention to the art treasures he found on his way and described them in a way which provokes a comparison between the two in this particular genre (viz. the description of Cologne Cathedral Forster, p. 23 f., Schlegel, p. 177-179). But whereas Schlegel is mainly concerned with art, Forster's account is far richer in detail and wider in outlook, and betrays the seasoned scientist, anthropologist, economist and historian. Having become famous through his *Voyage around the World* with Captain Cook (1777) he now brought the art of travel-report to perfection. His main concern was human, the conditions of the people he met and saw, the historical development underlying their lot; it is, as Schlegel had found in his essay on Forster, the sociological aspect which is so fascinating. He writes in fact a social history of the regions he visits; and the description of conditions in Belgium (Brabant and Flanders) a year after the rebellion against the Emperor Joseph II has become a classic piece of historical writing.

The Forster edition is sponsored by the Academy of the Sciences and the Arts of the German Democratic Republic. Herr Steiner has provided an excellent text; the variants among the five early prints are presented at the end of the volume where we also find an informative essay on the genesis and effect of the work (Alexander von Humboldt was Forster's companion during the journey). The notes provide an intelligent commentary based on the study of local history. A list of all the pictures of the Electoral Gallery in Düsseldorf in the year 1778 (Forster describes 75 out of 358 pictures), a good index of persons, a number of contemporary etchings as well as a map showing Forster's progress until he and Humboldt embarked for England, are useful aids.

Forster was able to complete only his report on the Lower Rhine, Belgium and Holland. His notes on England and France were published posthumously as the 3rd volume of the *Ansichten* in 1794. These will presumably be the contents of the next volume of the new edition and their publication is eagerly expected.

University of Melbourne

R. H. SAMUEL

TRISTAN. Translated by A. T. Hatto. *The Penguin Classics*, 1960, pp. 374.

THIS is a translation, into English prose, of Gottfried von Strassburg's *Tristan und Isold* and of the surviving fragments of Thomas's *Tristan*.

There are not many English translations of Middle High German poetry. Gottfried's poem had, however, been put into English comparatively recently by E. H. Zeydel (Princeton, 1948). At first sight it might therefore seem

surprising that another version should follow so soon. But an examination of the American work immediately reveals the need for a second translation. Zeydel's book consists of a rough rendering, into pseudo-mediaeval English verse, of some parts of the poem, with connecting summaries in prose. Like other translations from Middle High German, e.g. Margaret Armour's rendering of the *Nibelungenlied*, Zeydel's work is a product of sentiment rather than of scholarship.

Hatto's translation is quite different. Its sustained excellence is a constant astonishment to the reader. Hatto has based his text (unlike Zeydel) on the best edition of the poem, that of Friedrich Ranke (1930). The translation is in readable, modern English prose and is, in general, an accurate rendering of the meaning of the original. Hatto's work is therefore an important contribution to the understanding of Gottfried's poem. Scholars will eagerly look forward to the translator's publication (mentioned in the Introduction, p. 35), in which he promises to account for his readings.

Hatto himself remarks in the Introduction: 'To translate fine literature is to invite defeat in battle to gain a higher end.' Inevitably a great deal of Gottfried's subtlety is lost even by a translator of Hatto's quality. Yet it is astonishing how much is preserved, e.g. in the description of Wolfram (11. 4638-4641) as 'some friend of the hare, high-skipping and far-browsing, who seeks out Poetry's heath with dicing terms'. Hatto's work would undoubtedly have delighted Friedrich Ranke himself, who, in his last years, became progressively more interested in the possibilities of translating Middle High German into English.

The Introduction is as readable as the text, though Hatto is hampered by the need for brevity. He can only summarize his arguments, with little reference to the text, and to the differing view-points of earlier scholars. This reviewer remains as yet unconvinced by Hatto's arguments that the *minnetranc* is to be interpreted *literally* as the cause of Tristan's and Isold's love. In further writings Hatto may possibly substantiate his views at greater length.

Hatto's work is the product of fine and sensitive scholarship, combined with (like Bligger von Steinach!) inspiration and a subtle gift with words. New Zealand and Australian scholars, like those elsewhere, will welcome this work with gratitude and respect.

University of Auckland

J. A. ASHER

THE SMALL GERMAN COURTS IN THE 18TH CENTURY. By A. Fauchier-Magnan. London, Methuen, 1958, pp. 292.

THIS is really an essay on the Duchy of Wurttemberg in the 18th century, preceded by an extended essay on the general condition of the smaller German courts of the period, and followed by an excursus on the family of the Count of Montbéliard (Mömpelgard). The main difference from Prof. W. H. Bruford's classic *Germany in the 18th Century* (C.U.P. 1935) lies in its concentration on the love-life of the period and its quotations from the reports of contemporary French travellers.

From the point of view of the social historian, indeed, M. Fauchier-Magnan succeeds only in saying in his 292 pages what Professor Bruford said in 129 pages of his study. He says, in fact, considerably less since he has restricted himself to the courts as such. Thus the main areas where he supplements Bruford are in detailed observation of the princes' eating-habits and their mistresses. We also learn a good deal about the princes' taste for luxury building, down to and including the names of their stucco-

Book Reviews

workers, especially where any of these were Frenchmen or had worked in France.

The one thing that can safely be said about M. Fauchier-Magnan is that his critical point of view is extraordinarily Gallic. His 10-page bibliography is almost entirely French and ninety per cent of his footnotes are quotations from the reports of contemporary French travellers. This might not be so disturbing were it not for the fact that the picture of Germany he thus presents is so nauseating as to be insulting.

Of course there were revolting autocrats amongst the many petty princes of 18th century Germany. But a critical study which presents merely their revolting aspects is plainly one-sided. Even a hero-worshipper such as George Henry Lewes was so struck by the lack of the niceties of civilised life in mid-19th century Thuringia as to devote a whole chapter to it in his still authoritative biography of Goethe. This study, however, leaves one with the distinct impression of its author's complete lack of understanding of the relative lack of civilised living *throughout* Western Europe in the periods preceding the Age of Sewerage and Hygiene which set in around 1850. It is only necessary to point to the difficulties which beset the lives of reformers like Jenner and Pasteur to show that hygiene is a modern concept. Whilst no student of the Paris of Louis XVI (or Napoleon III, for that matter) will be particularly impressed by M. Fauchier-Magnan's incessant moralism about the 'Mätressenwirtschaft' of the German 18th-century courts—except possibly to share his surprise at the squalidity and petty scale on which everything was conducted. The final excursus on the court of Montbéliard with its incest and plain lunacy seems to have been added purely 'pour fin de comble' (addiction to French decorative phrases is something one catches from this translation).

The 18th century is for Germany so important—it was the seed-bed of the whole uplifting of the human spirit which has made German literature into the tremendous creation it is—that all additions to our knowledge of its background are of importance. At least they should be. After reading M. Fauchier-Magnan's book one is, however, left wondering at the final impression which French Germanistics leave on students in France.

University of Adelaide

DEREK VAN ABBE

NOVALIS AND MATHEMATICS. Martin Dyck. A study of Friedrich von Hardenberg's Fragments on Mathematics and its relation to Magic, Music, Religion, Philosophy, Language and Literature. *University of North Carolina Studies in the Germanic Languages and Literatures*, No. 27. Chapel Hill, 1960. pp. iii + 108.

THE most penetrating study on this subject is Käthe Hamburger's essay 'Novalis und die Mathematik. Eine Studie Zur Erkenntnistheorie der Romantik' in *Romantik-Forschungen*, Halle, 1929, pp. 115-184. Professor Dyck, who fully appreciates the value of this study (cf. p. 14 ff), intends to supplement it in several respects. He rightly points out that Dr Hamburger sees Novalis too much in the light and even as a predecessor of the Neo-Kantian school which flourished in Germany at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and that she concentrates too exclusively on Novalis' conceptions of function, continuity, infinity, time and space. Professor Dyck in contrast attempts to place Novalis' thoughts on mathematics in the historical context of his own time, to elucidate every aspect of them including those which were not dealt with by Dr Hamburger (e.g. definition,

axiom, theorem, proof, number and many others), and finally to relate Novalis' mathematical concepts to his thoughts on other fields of the sciences and humanities and to his creative writing.

The main value of Professor Dyck's study as compared with that of his only predecessor will be found in the fact that he is able to assess Novalis' knowledge of mathematics in the light of mathematical achievements of his own time. This most fruitful comparison shows clearly that Novalis was no more 'muddled' or 'fantastic' or even 'mystical' than contemporary mathematicians. Even Newton, not to speak of Leibniz and others, could have his 'lyrical moments' when pondering over the possibilities that opened up with the discovery of infinitesimal and differential calculus. The essential point, however, is that Novalis' utterances are philosophical and not technical, that they are unrigorous and even arbitrary, although he is 'exceedingly consistent with his own embryonic system of thought', in which it does not matter that he is not bound by the shackles of any formal discipline. Professor Dyck states: 'In his seemingly fantastic ideas on mathematics there will be discernible a deep insight into the nature of this science.' (p. 3). This line Professor Dyck unfolds clearly and most interestingly, inquiring first into the sources of Novalis' writings on mathematics available to him, then discussing critically previous studies on the subject, fixing the contemporary scene of mathematical knowledge and placing Novalis' own statements in this context. Finally he shows not only how Novalis tries to 'mathematize' all other sciences and the humanities (see the sub-title of the book), but how mathematical concepts are used by him as images in his poetic works, acting as a 'symbolic medium'. For mathematics is, indeed, the 'spinal cord' in all of Novalis' thinking. From this point of view not only the charming poem that was to be inserted in the second part of 'Heinrich von Ofterdingen' beginning

Wenn nicht mehr Zahlen und Figuren
Sind Schlüssel aller Kreaturen . . .

can be understood properly, but even the last set of aphorisms headed *Mathematische Fragmente*, which was called by Wilhelm Dilthey rather contemptuously 'Mathematische Hymnen', makes sense. *Der echte Mathematiker ist Enthusiast per se,—Ohne Enthusiasmus keine Mathematik* and *Wer ein mathematisches Buch nicht mit Andacht ergreift und es, wie Gottes Wort, liest, der versteht es nicht*, says Novalis here.

Professor Dyck's final conclusion is that Novalis had a thorough grounding in mathematics, grasping this subject both in its formal aspect and its philosophical implications (p. 94). The hitherto unpublished body of mathematical papers which will appear in vol. III of *Novalis Schriften* (Kohlhammer, Stuttgart 1962) will probably underline this statement, in particular as far as the formal aspects are concerned.

University of Melbourne

RICHARD SAMUEL

RUSSIAN FOR SCIENTISTS. Dennis Ward, *London, University of London Press*, 1960, pp. 204.

With the tremendous increase in interest shown by scientists and students of science all over the world in the advances made by Russian in the field of science, the study of the Russian language has become of paramount interest. It is not so much mastery of the language in all its aspects, grammatical, literary and conversational, that is the immediate goal of foreign students (a goal that, anyway, cannot be attained in a short time and with-

Book Reviews

out much hard work). There is a much more practical goal: how to gain enough basic knowledge of the Russian language, grammar and vocabulary to be able to translate, with the help of a good dictionary, any scientific paper on a particular specialised subject from Russian into English. As a result, special courses were started a few years ago in almost all English-speaking countries, privately and under the sponsorship of Adult Education organisations or at Universities, in so-called 'Science Russian'. Many of these courses claimed to be able to impart, even to students who had never studied any foreign language before, enough knowledge of Russian in twenty or thirty one-hour lessons to enable them to 'crack' any scientific paper in Russian (with the aid of a dictionary, of course). To any serious student of Russian the fallacy of this claim was obvious. Practice has shown, even to the most enthusiastic and optimistic tutors of Science Russian, that twenty or thirty lessons were quite insufficient to make a proficient and satisfactory translator out of a 'greenhorn', that the building up of a sound basic knowledge of Russian grammar and vocabulary was an essential prerequisite for becoming proficient in translating scientific documents from the Russian language. As a result, a host of 'aids' in helping to teach Science Russian appeared in the form of Science readers and general manuals, some of them moderately good, but in most cases quite unsatisfactory.

The book *Russian for Scientists* by Dennis Ward is a most welcome addition to the existing list of manuals for teaching 'Science' Russian. In point of fact it is an extremely well thought out and well planned and developed course, which, if adhered to closely, will help any student to master the basic requirements for reading scientific and specialised papers in Russian; it will also greatly facilitate the task of the tutor. It provides a very good 'recognition' course, which is aimed at helping students to master as quickly as possible and as thoroughly as possible enough Russian to enable them to understand technical and scientific literature in Russian. The course is well graduated and intelligently planned. Chapter I, on the Alphabet and pronunciation, is actually one of the best which have so far appeared in English-produced manuals for the teaching and learning of Russian. The purely grammatical material is also very well presented, and so is the basic vocabulary. Last but not least, there are four important appendices to the main body of the book dealing with declension patterns (paradigms) of nouns and adjectives and intended to help the student recognise one and the same morpheme in spite of the changing shape; the last Appendix, finally, is a ready reference table of the most common 'anomalous' verbs, a most important component in the mastery of basic Russian.

The book will be founded extremely valuable both by teachers and students: it does away most convincingly with the assumption that 'Science' Russian can be taught and learned in a score of lessons and without sustained effort, but at the same time it provides the serious student with a sure and dependable guide to proficiency. Mr Ward's manual will be especially welcomed by university teachers and students.

University of Canterbury

E. de LABERBIS

60 RUSSIAN PROSES, A. B. Murphy & G. M. Schatunowski, *London. Methuen*, pp. 64.

THIS is a book which will be welcomed by all teachers of Russian: to a certain extent it fills a vacuum, owing to the extreme scarcity of these manuals on the market. It is intended for students who have

- Book Reviews

passed the Ordinary Level of the GCE, and the pieces for translation have been arranged in order of difficulty.

Every passage is followed by a list of the main idioms to be used in translating the text into Russian. Intricate grammatical points are also well treated.

In the hands of an experienced teacher, *60 Russian Proses* will be a valuable help in conducting classes in translation from English into Russian.

KNIGA DLIA CHTENIA DLIA STUDENTOV INOSTRANTSEV (A RUSSIAN READER FOR FOREIGN STUDENTS). Edited by C. V. James and I. B. Faden. *London, Bradda Books, 1960, pp. 53.*

THIS little reader contains 28 passages extracted mainly from contemporary Russian authors, and will be found useful as an aid in conducting classes with beginners. The subject matter is diversified and covers many aspects of every-day life in Russia; the language is modern and contains many Soviet neologisms and idioms. Useful exercises accompany every passage. The Russian-English vocabulary given at the end of the booklet, called with commendable modesty 'A minimum vocabulary' is rather inadequate. The translations given are by no means the only renderings possible; the idiomatic meaning of many words is not given and there are even glaring inaccuracies, as for example on p. 51: 'plov' a provincialism for the standard 'pilav', a meal consisting of rice, mutton and sultanas cooked in butter or mutton fat; on p. 53, 'tchernovye nabrossky'—rough copy, instead of 'rough sketches', etc.

A BOOK OF RUSSIAN IDIOMS. I. B. Faden, *London, Methuen, 1960. pp. 63.*

THE very title of the booklet is pretentious and misleading: it would have been more appropriate to call it 'A short selection of Russian Idioms', and that is what it really is. Very few modern Russian idioms are treated, and some of the old ones given are obsolete like the quotation from D. V. Grigorovitch (1822-1899) given on p. 47.

As it is, however, this booklet may be of use to students of Russian beginning reading of Russian classics.

University of Canterbury

E. de LABERBIS

COURSE IN GENERAL LINGUISTICS, Ferdinand de Saussure, Edited by Charles Bally and Albert Séchehaye in collaboration with Albert Reidlinger (*sic*). Translated from the French by Wade Baskin. *New York, Philosophical Library, 1959.*

THIS first English translation of Saussure's *Cours* appears nearly half a century after the publication in book form of the original French edition (1916), and long after the publication of German and Spanish versions. With such a considerable time lag, one is compelled to ask whether this translation was really necessary. Mr Baskin offers two reasons for his work. In his introduction he says (p. xii): 'By making available an English translation of his *Course*, I hope to contribute towards the realisation of his goal: the study of language in and for itself'; and earlier (p. xi) he claims

Book Reviews

of Saussure that 'the full implications of his teachings, for both static and evolutionary studies, have still to be elaborated'.

Both of these statements are declarations of faith which could give rise to interminable discussion. The surprising feature of them, and of the whole two-page introduction by the translator, is the complete failure to mention that most of Saussure's ideas have been given very considerable development, that in fact they are at the basis of modern structuralist linguistics. Even in the United States, where structuralism was long claimed by some to be an indigenous growth (which it is in part), Saussure's importance is now adequately acknowledged. Even more serious perhaps, is the failure to give any indication that some of his most fundamental distinctions, after much modification, are now being abandoned by some linguists; and that the very compilation translated has been subjected to book-length textual criticism (by Robert Godel). Saussure gave the world of linguistics a new axis of rotation in the universe of knowledge, but it has spun through many a revolution since then. It would have been invaluable to have had along with this translation a bibliography of the main exegetical and critical books and articles on the *Cours*, or even an introduction setting the work in its historical perspective as the major source of some of the most fruitful principles on which structuralism is founded. For the *Cours* is hardly a finished dogma, however much some may have wished so to treat it. The uninitiated reader, who will be most served by Mr Baskin's translation, is unfortunately likely to get the impression that Saussure's work has received very inadequate attention from his colleagues and successors.

At the same time, the existence of an English translation undoubtedly widens the readers of the *Cours*, and such a result cannot but be welcomed. As a translator, Mr Baskin has generally speaking done his job well: his version is as readable as the subject allows, with most departures from the original justifiable or minor. There is one serious error in terminology, the translation of the famous *langue:parole* opposition by 'language:speaking'. 'Speech' has long been the standard term for *parole* in the Saussurean sense. One wonders also what really good reason there was for translating *signification* by 'signification'. The index follows that of the original in being rather limited, although it is more complete for proper names. 'Alteration' for 'alternation' (p. 235) is a serious misprint. Darmesteter is deprived (pp. 32, 236) of the first *e* in his name, and Riedlinger is most unhappily misspelt on the title page while figuring correctly spelt in the more obscure pages of the editors' introduction (p. xiv).

University of Auckland

K. J. HOLLYMAN

THE TREE OF LANGUAGE. Helene and Charlton Laird. Illustrated by Ervine Metzel. London, Faber and Faber, 1960. pp. 216.

THIS introduction to the study of language for young readers, written by the Professor of English at the University of Nevada and his wife, a well-known author of children's books in the U.S.A., has been specially edited in an English edition by Agnes Allen, a well-known author of children's books in Britain. In the absence of a copy of the original edition, one can only assume that Mrs Allen's task was essentially one of de-americanisation. The task was not quite completed, as certain homophones valid in American but not in Standard English still appear (p. 84: *aunt, ant; can't, cant*; p. 135: *daler, dollar*), and *sassy* survives without explanation in a children's rhyme (p. 187).

- Book Reviews

Apart from generally admirable chapters on the beginnings of language, writing and printing, the scope of the book is limited to the Indo-European languages, and within these to English. Even in the many word histories given, little account is taken of borrowings from other than I.E. languages, so that *porterhouse steak*, for example, gets a full page, while the common *potato* remains unmentioned. When, to close the book, a would-be humorous venture is made outside the well-trodden field, to produce (p.203) a Maori musical instrument called a *zzxjoanw* (undefined, but pronounced 'shaw'!), the reader realises with some dismay that the authors have perhaps taken too seriously some of the implications of their remarks about primitiveness and lack of writing (p.59), and the etymological relationship between *city* and *civilization* (p.122-3). In a book for the modern child, surely suitable stress should be laid on international linguistic exchanges and some respect shown for the validity, and the true representation, of the structure of other tongues.

Within its chosen limits, the book is interestingly written, if not always well organised. The excellent semantic chain treatment used with many of the word histories which form half the book (for example, *pie* 'bird', *pie* 'pasty', *pied* and *piebald* are all treated under *PIE*), is counterbalanced by the alphabetic listing rather than semantic grouping of these word histories. Such an arrangement is quite unnecessary when there is an exhaustive alphabetical index at the end of the book. Similarly, in a chapter called 'Odd Things about Words' (pp. 81-90), important topics such as onomatopoeia, incomplete derivational groups, words with two opposed meanings, homophones, etc., are well and simply explained, but they form something of a hotch-potch.

The information given in the word histories is generally accurate and well presented. The rapid changes of topic lead occasionally to incomplete explanations (p.169: March's lion-like entry is made clear, but not its lamb-like exit; p.202: *zodiac* is not linked with *zodiokos*), neglect of worthwhile associations or meanings (p.124: *constable* and *marshal*; p.126: the billiard *cue*), and minor errors (p.109: 'a man who had weapons . . .' could be called in Latin *armata*; p.108: all landing craft were not amphibians, and children probably know it!). Printing errors are very rare (p.109, 1.27; p.151, 1.17; p.164, 1.22; *mem-* but 1.29: *men-*; p.190: the horizontal alignment in the table is etymologically wrong).

On the whole, then, this is a good book, interestingly written, which could have been excellent with more care. There is after all a sound case for a children's book being more accurate and better planned than an academic treatise.

University of Auckland

K. J. HOLLYMAN

THE THEATRE OF THE LONDON FAIRS IN THE 18TH CENTURY.
Sybil Rosenfeld. Cambridge University Press, 1960, pp. xii + 194.

WHEN, in the 1920's, Professor Allardyce Nicoll wrote his massive history of Restoration and eighteenth century English drama, he almost entirely ignored the activities of the strolling players in the provinces and the London fairs. Little, in fact, was known about them. Since then the members of the Society for Theatre Research in England, and a group of scholars in America, have been piecing together the story of the itinerant theatres from municipal records, playbills, memoirs, above all from the scattered notices in newspaper files.

Book Reviews

It was Miss Rosenfeld, in her *Strolling Players and Drama in the Provinces* (1939), who first made known in fullest detail the history of the provincial theatre during this period. It remains an important and absorbing book. After a long interval she has now filled the remaining gap in our knowledge of the eighteenth century theatre with this present account of the seasonal performances at the booths and inns of the London fairs, those crowded popular shows that could also attract more sophisticated audiences during the vacations of the patent houses, though they were regarded by the municipal authorities as thoroughly disreputable places and their promoters even more rigorously prosecuted than the vagrant companies of the provinces.

It is a less notable book than Miss Rosenfeld's former one, if only because the subject is less important and has less novelty: Mr Leo Hughes had already acquainted us in outline with the playing at the fairs in a chapter of his *Century of English Farce* (1956). Disappointingly, it is also a duller, infinitely less readable book than her earlier one. Formidably full and exactly documented, it is too congested with facts and rarely achieves the illuminating interpretation of her material that made her other book so engaging.

In three chapters on Bartholomew Fair, two on Southwark Fair, one on May Fair, and a seventh on lesser fairs, she perseveringly and drearily catalogues and chronicles the drolls, farces, puppet-shows, operas, pantomimes, and exhibitions presented, the advertising methods, prices of admission, expenses, and hours of performance, along with the records of the proprietors and actors. It is only in the two final chapters that she attempts, somewhat perfunctorily, to extract the essence of this agglomerated material and assess its importance.

Makeshift as most of these performances were, it is evident that the more ambitious showmen often aimed at elaborate staging, though Miss Rosenfeld may be suspected of confusing intention with achievement when she claims that productions at the fairs were sometimes scarcely less skilful and elaborate than those at the regular theatres. When noblemen and respectable citizens who not infrequently visited the booths expressed satisfaction with the show, it is likely that their expectations had not been high and that they were more diverted by the jollity of the occasion than edified by the quality of the performance. Nevertheless, in the 1730's, when the theatrical activity of the fairs was at its highest and the players were caught up in the success of *The Beggar's Opera*, they were capable of producing imitations of their own, of sufficient merit, some of them, to find their way back to the London stage. The acting also at times was demonstrably more accomplished than might have been expected. The fairs were the nurseries of some distinguished players and not infrequently recruited established performers by providing employment during the summer vacation of the London theatres.

On matters of more literary interest, as distinct from the strictly theatrical, one can agree with Miss Rosenfeld that the fairs kept alive many elements of an older folk drama, thus providing corroboration for some of our informed guesses about the Elizabethan drama. Agreed, too, that the survival of the drolls led to the later vogue for melodrama in the regular theatres. When she goes on to imply that the continuing exploitation of popular legends at the fairs is to be rated with Percy's *Reliques* as a seed-bed of the romantic revival she is patently overstating her case.

For the specialist on the theatre this will be a necessary reference book. The student of drama may well be content with the more compact account

Book Reviews

in Hughes's book. The subject, after all, is of minor importance in the history of eighteenth century drama.

University of Adelaide

C. J. HORNE

THE ORIGIN OF THE CAROLINGIAN EMPIRE. Peter Munz. *Dunedin, University of Otago Press*, 1960, pp. 43.

FEW events in European history have excited warmer debate than the imperial coronation of Charlemagne in St Peter's on Christmas Day 800. Who instigated the ceremony, what did it mean to the participants, and what sort of 'Empire' was thereby created or restored? The dispute about these matters has been carried on mainly by French and German scholars, the former commonly anxious to stress the 'Roman' aspect and the latter the 'Frankish'. Nationalism has invaded this as many another historical domain, and the way you interpret the scanty and conflicting sources would seem to depend partly on whether you think of the great Emperor as Charlemagne or as Karl der Grosse.

Dr Munz, in this admirably skilful piece of historical reconstruction, has carefully re-examined all the evidence, weighed the arguments of recent investigators, and shown that a good deal of the confusion can be removed if we remember that the coronation, far from being the outcome of a master-plan agreed on by all parties, meant different things to different people. Charlemagne himself, conscious of his position as the most powerful ruler in Christendom, was irritated at being treated by the arrogant Byzantines as a mere Germanic *rex* and was anxious to extort from Constantinople recognition that his status was equal to that of the *Basileus*. His friend and adviser Alcuin, who spoke for the Latin churchmen, saw in him the head and protector of the Church and Papacy, a new David, whose realm was practically coterminous with Western Christendom, and whose position as a kind of Christian Caliph and defender of the faith should be signalized by an appropriate title. Pope Leo III, a politician of tarnished reputation little given to theorizing, wanted Frankish protection against his enemies in Rome and was perhaps eager to break the last links with Byzantium. Here were three separate lines converging on one point: Charlemagne as Emperor. Dr Munz, following clues provided by Erdmann and Fichtenau, detects a fourth: an anti-Roman Frankish party who were planning to create an imperial centre, a kind of Germanic Byzantium, at Aix-la-Chapelle. Charlemagne was subjected to rival pressures, from Aix and from Rome: largely because of Alcuin's urgent pleas that he should rescue the Church, he went to Italy and restored the Pope, whereupon Leo and the Roman churchmen won over the Frankish leaders and persuaded Charlemagne to become Emperor—in Rome. Thus Aix was defeated, and the new Empire assumed a Roman instead of a Germanic aspect.

It is a fascinating speculation, but the evidence cited cannot be said to provide firm proof, and Dr Munz admits that he cannot identify very clearly any member of the 'Aix party'. It seems doubtful if the *Annals of Lorsch*, here considered as reflecting the views of this group, can bear the weight of interpretation put upon them. One feels that behind the theory lies the old idea of simple Germans being trickled by subtle Romans. Certainly, Leo outmatched Charlemagne at the end, by arranging matters in such a way as to make it appear that the King had received the imperial crown as a gift from the Pope. This no doubt is the meaning of Charlemagne's angry outburst, recorded by Einhard, that had he known the

Book Reviews

Pope's intentions, he would never have set foot in the church. He could not indeed foresee a time when the Popes would claim that by their own supreme authority they had 'transferred' the Empire from the Greeks to the Franks, but he had wished to become Emperor in his own way and in his own time and he resented a precipitate papal action which put him in a false position. One wonders if the Pope's move was hastened by an occurrence Dr Munz does not mention: the arrival in Rome on December 23, two days before the coronation, of an embassy from the Patriarch of Jerusalem to present the Frankish King with the keys of the Holy Sepulchre. The incident must have made a deep impression, and gave rise in after ages to the legend enshrined in the 12th century romance, *Le Voyage de Charlemagne à Jerusalem*. Christians of East and West had now acknowledged the supremacy of Charlemagne: surely this was the moment to place on his head the imperial crown?

Dr Munz has written a stimulating and challenging essay and has set many aspects of the affair in a new light. The format of the publication is a credit to the University of Otago Press. I have noticed only one error: 'June 799' on page 24 should be 'June 800'.

University of Canterbury

J. J. SAUNDERS

YEARBOOK OF COMPARATIVE AND GENERAL LITERATURE No. IX, ed. by K. L. Selig and Horst Frenz, *Chapel Hill* 1960, 194 pp. 3 plates.

THIS Yearbook was founded by Dr Werner P. Friederich, Kenan Professor of German and Comparative Literature at the University of North Carolina. Professor Friederich has now resigned the editorship, and this publication will from 1961 onwards no longer appear within the framework of his University's 'Studies in Comparative Literature', but by Indiana University under its new chief editor, Professor Horst Frenz. It is only fitting that among the customary 'profiles' in Part II of this issue one of the four should be dedicated to Werner Friederich himself. Professor Oscar Seidlin is the author of this very personal tribute (pp. 77-79) which will evoke in many readers of this journal happy reminiscences of one who has been a steady friend of AUMLA and AULLA and attended the Congress of 1955 in Brisbane in person.

Part V of this issue contains a Bibliography of Comparative Literature, that has been an annual supplement to the *Bibliography of Comparative Literature* issued by Friederich in co-operation with Fernand Baldensperger in 1950 (*Chapel Hill*). The review section (Part IV) is this time chiefly devoted to a critical assessment of recent translations, e.g. the Complete Greek Tragedies by Green and Lattimore in 4 volumes with general and individual introductions, the works of Catullus, Horace, Juvenal, the maxims by La Rochefoucauld, Schiller's 'Maiden of Orleans' (evidently a failure because of its adherence to 'literality' at any cost) and Heinrich Mann's 'The Blue Angel', which seems to make complete nonsense of the original and is moreover unmasked as plagiarism from a previous translation.

This year's issue is, however, outstanding for the contribution by H. H. Remak on *Comparative Literature at the Crossroads: Diagnosis, Therapy, and Prognosis* (pp. 1-28). The author describes the crisis in this discipline frankly: the deep-seated cleavages between the American and the French (also German) point of view which clashed at the Chapel Hill Congress in 1958, the divergences between theory and actual achievements, the dangers

of triviality in research, the inability to define the orbit of the discipline. But the therapeutic part of the article does not leave the reader without hope. The bibliography at the end of Professor Remak's judicious inquiry gives every literary historian interested in the comparative field a good guide to further study.

University of Melbourne

RICHARD SAMUEL

BOOKS RECEIVED

*Reviewed in this issue

- ANDERSON, W. E., *German for the Technologist*, London, Harrap, 1960, pp. 293.
- BAILEY, H. W. (ed.), *Khotanese Texts IV*, Indo-Scythian Studies, Cambridge University Press, 1961, pp. 189.
- BENNETT, H. S., *Life on the English Manor*, Cambridge University Press, 1960, pp. 364.
- BISHOP, Thomas, *Pirandello and the French Theatre*, London, Peter Owen, 1960, pp. xix + 170.
- BLANC, Michel, *Visages de la France contemporaine*, London, Harrap, 1960, pp. 218.
- *BLAIR, Dorothy S., *Jules Supervielle*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1960, pp. 186.
- BLISS, A. J. (ed.), *Sir Launfal*, London, Nelson, pp. 153.
- BOCK, C. V. and SENIOR, G. F. (eds.), *Goethe the Critic*, Manchester University Press, 1960, pp. 142.
- *BRADBROOK, M. C., *Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy*, Cambridge University Press, pp. 275.
- *BREWER, D. S. (ed.), *The Parlement of Foullys*, Nelson, 1960, pp. 168.
- *BROADHEAD, H. D., *The Persae of Aeschylus*, Cambridge University Press, 1960, pp. lxiii + 350.
- BROWNE, E. Martin (ed.), Eugene O'Neill, *Ah Wilderness! The Hairy Ape, All God's Chillun Got Wings*, Penguin, 1960, pp. 234.
- *CHADWICK, Charles, *Etudes sur Rimbaud*, Paris, Nizet, 1960, pp. 154.
- CLARK, Kenneth, *Looking at Pictures*, London, Murray, 1960, pp. 199.
- CLAYTON, D. E. and CADIX, J., *Harrap's Advanced Level French Course*, London, Harrap, 1961, pp. 268.
- COHEN, J. M. and M. J., *Dictionary of Quotations*, Penguin, 1960, pp. 663.
- COHEN, J. M. (tr.), Pascal, *The Pensées*, Penguin, 1961, pp. 285.
- COULSON, Evelyn, *Les Aventures d'Alexandre*, London, Harrap, 1960, pp. 71.
- CRAWFORD, Thomas, *Burns*, Edinburgh, Oliver & Boyd, 1960, pp. 400.
- CRUIKSHANK, J., *Critical Readings in the Modern French Novel*, London, Macmillan, 1961, pp. 152.
- CURNOW, Allen (ed.), *The Penguin Book of New Zealand Verse*, Penguin, 1960, pp. 337.
- ELCOCK, W. D., *The Romance Languages*, London, Faber & Faber, 1960, pp. 570.
- ELENGORN, S., *Le Pays de Charles*, London, Methuen, 1961, pp. 175.
- *FADEN, I. B., *A Book of Russian Idioms*, London, Methuen, 1960, pp. 64.
- FELVER, Charles S., *Robert Armin, Shakespeare's Fool*, Ohio, Kent State University, 1961, pp. v + 82.

Books Received

- FOAKES, R. A. and PICKERT, R. T., *Henslowe's Diary*, Cambridge University Press, 1961, pp. lix + 368.
- FORSTER, E. M., *The Longest Journey*, Penguin, 1960, pp. 288.
- FOSTER, J. R., *O Level Tests in German*, London, Methuen, 1960, pp. 140.
- FRANCE, Anatole, *Le crime de Sylvestre Bonnard*, London, Harrap, 1960, pp. xxxix + 234.
- *GETTMANN, R. A., *A Victorian Publisher*, Cambridge University Press, 1960, pp. 272.
- *GIBSON, Robert, *Modern French Poets on Poetry*, Cambridge University Press, 1961, pp. xv + 292.
- *GIRDLESTONE, C. M. (Essays presented to). Newcastle, University of Durham, 1960, pp. 368.
- GOLDING, William, *Lord of the Flies*, Penguin, 1960, pp. 192.
- GREEN, Peter, *Essays in Antiquity*, London, Murray, 1960, pp. 224.
- HAMBURGER, Michael (ed.), *Hölderlin*, Penguin, 1961, pp. xxvii + 269.
- HARVARD, Joseph, *Beginners' French*, University of London Press, 1960, pp. 118.
- HIRSCH, E. D. Jr., *Wordsworth and Schelling*, Yale University Press, 1960, pp. xi + 214.
- HOLBROOK, David, *English for Maturity*, Cambridge University Press, 1961, pp. xii + 255.
- HORSMAN, E. A. (ed.), *Bartholomew Fair*, Ben Jonson, London, Methuen, 1960, pp. xxxiv + 177.
- HUCH, Ricarda, *Der Letzte Sommer*, London, Harrap, 1960, pp. 159.
- ITALIAN STORIES, *Novelle Italiane*, Bantam Books, 1961, pp. 354.
- JACQUES-BENOIST, M. *Pionnier des grands lacs*, London, Harrap, 1960, pp. 88.
- JOHNSON, R. V., *Walter Pater*, Melbourne University Press, 1961, pp. 53.
- JONES, F. J., *A Modern Italian Grammar*, London, 1960, pp. 390.
- JONES, P. Mansell (Studies presented to), *Studies in Modern French Literature*, Manchester University Press, 1961, pp. xix + 339.
- KING, E. S., *Speak Malay!* University of London Press, 1960, pp. 255.
- KNIGHT, R. C. (ed.), *Nicomède*, Pierre Corneille, University of London Press, 1960, pp. 159.
- LAGEARD, Guy, *Le français moderne*, London, Blackie, 1960, pp. 233.
- LAVAUD, Guy, *Choix de poèmes*, Blainville-sur-mer, publ. priv., pp. 112.
- LAWRENCE, D. H., *Love among the Haystacks*, Penguin, pp. 173.
- Mornings in Mexico and Etruscan Places*, Penguin, 1960, pp. 215.
- LEDESERT, R. P. and D. M., *Chez nous en France*, London, Harrap, 1960, pp. 128.
- LESSING, Doris, *The Habit of Loving*, Penguin, 1960, pp. 247.
- LOTI, P., *Pêcheur d'Islande*, London, Harrap, 1960, pp. xxxv + 266.
- MACKWORTH, Cecily, *Guillaume Apollinaire and the Cubist Life*, London, Murray, 1961, pp. 244.
- MCLEOD, A. L. (ed.), *The Commonwealth Pen*, Cornell University Press, 1961, pp. 243.
- MOORE, Harry T., *The Intelligent Heart*, the story of D. H. Lawrence, Penguin, 1960, pp. 560.
- *NORMAN, F. (ed.), *Schiller : Bicentennial Lectures*, London, Institute of Germanic Languages and Literatures, 1960, pp. 168.
- PELLING, H., *Modern Britain*, Edinburgh, Nelson, 1960, pp. 212.
- *PETTET, E. C., *Of Paradise and Light*, Cambridge University Press, 1960, pp. 217.

- Books Received

- *PROUDFOOT, L., *Dryden's Aeneid and its Seventeenth Century Predecessors*, Manchester University Press, 1960, pp. 278.
- PRYCE, D. K., *Voici la France!* London, Harrap, 1960, pp. 168.
- ROMAINS, Jules, *Bertrand de Ganges*, London, Harrap, 1961, pp. 117.
- ROSE, Ernst, *A History of German Literature*, London, Peter Owen, 1961, pp. xiii + 353.
- ROSENBERG, Edgar, *From Shylock to Svengali*, London, Peter Owen, 1961, pp. 388.
- *ROSENFELD, Sybil, *The Theatre of the London Fairs in the Eighteenth Century*, Cambridge University Press, 1960, pp. 194.
- SEATON, Ethel, *Sir Richard Roos, Lancastrian Poet*, London, Hart-Davis, 1961, pp. 592.
- TILLET, Margaret, *On Reading Flaubert*, Oxford University Press, 1961, pp. 135.
- TRAVIS, J. E. and AULD, D. M., *Etudes supérieures de français*, Pt. II, London, Harrap, 1960, pp. 290.
- TULANE STUDIES IN ENGLISH, Vol. X, New Orleans, Tulane University, 1960, pp. 151.
- *ULLMANN, Stephen, *The Image in the Modern French Novel*, Cambridge University Press, 1960, pp. 314.
- VALGIMIGLI, Maria, *Living Italian*, London University Press, 1960, pp. 254.
- VIER, Jacques, *Histoire de la littérature française*, London, Harrap, 1959, pp. 533.
- WAIDSON, H. M. (ed.), *Modern German Stories*, London, Faber & Faber, 1961, pp. 232.
- WALSH, P. G., *Livy, His Historical Aims and Methods*, Cambridge University Press, 1961, pp. 301.
- *WARD, Dennis, *Russian for Scientists*, London University Press, 1960, pp. 204.
- WHINNOM, Keith, *Spanish in the Philippines*, Hong Kong University Press, 1954, pp. 194.
- WILLEY, P. R. E., *Guten Tag!*, London, Harrap, 1961, pp. 151.
- WILLIAMS, W. E. (ed.), *Thomas Hardy*, Penguin, 1960, pp. 219.
- WILSON, J. Dover (ed.), *Culture and Anarchy*, Matthew Arnold, Cambridge University Press, 1960, pp. 241.
- WOLEDGE, Brian (ed.), *The Penguin Book of French Verse, I. To the Fifteenth Century*, Penguin, 1961, pp. xxx + 341.
- *WOODWARD, E. A., *Poems of a Physician*, Launceston, Foot & Playsted, 1960, pp. 25.
- ZUCKMAYER, Carl, *Das Kalte Licht*, London, Methuen, 1960, pp. 238.

NOTES

In the autumn of 1961, *Studies in Romanticism*, a new quarterly journal sponsored by the Graduate School, Boston University, will begin publication. As its title indicates, the journal will be devoted to the study of all aspects and manifestations of the Romantic Movement.

Manuscripts dealing with any aspect of the Movement—on literature, writers, literary relationships, music, art, and the like—are welcome. All manuscripts must be in English.

The subscription price is \$4.00 per year, and subscriptions should be sent to the editor, *Studies in Romanticism*, 236 Bay State Road, Boston, 15, Massachusetts.

MODERN LANGUAGE BOOKS

An absolutely reliable service for overseas libraries and the private buyer. A stock in French, German, Spanish, Italian that ranges from the earliest texts to the latest in fiction, drama and linguistics. Regular bibliographical lists of new books and reprints. These are some of the facilities we offer. Have you yet tried them?

GRANT AND CUTLER LTD

(INTERNATIONAL BOOK CLUB)

Foreign Booksellers

11 BUCKINGHAM ST., STRAND, LONDON, W.C.2



Recent Publications

L'ART DE CONJUGUER (Le Nouveau Bescherelle)

8,000 French verbs and how to conjugate them. 6s. 6d.

ETUDES SUPERIEURES DE FRANCAIS

A course at University Entrance level, completing the well established series by J. E. TRAVIS, M.A., and D. M. AULD, M.A. Part I, 11s. 6d. Part II, 10s. 6d.

A FRENCH COURSE FOR TECHNOLOGISTS AND STUDENTS

By H. SHELDON JACKSON, M.A., and J. STANDRING, M.A. 16s.

HARRAP'S ADVANCED LEVEL FRENCH COURSE

By D. E. CLAYTON, B.A. and J. CADIX, L. ES L., this course contains 36 passages for translation from modern French authors, a selection of modern French poetry, 36 passages from British authors annotated for translation, a grammar section and vocabularies. In two parts. 10s. 6d. each.

LE BAL DES VOLEURS

By JEAN ANOUILH. With introduction and notes by W. D. HOWARTH, M.A. 6s. 6d.

LES JUSTES

By ALBERT CAMUS. Edited with introduction and notes by EDWARD MARSH, M.A. 6s. 6d.

MOLIERE'S L'ECOLE DES MARIS

The latest addition to *Harrap's French Classics Series*, edited with introduction and notes by PETER H. NURSE, M.A. 6s. 6d.

CHEZ NOUS EN FRANCE

Eight short stories by modern French authors, with biographical introductions and notes by R. P. L. LEDESERT, L. EN D., L. ES L. and D. M. LEDESERT, M.A. 6s. 6d.

Please order through your usual bookseller. Prices quoted above are London published prices.

George G. Harrap & Co Ltd

Represented by:

The Australasian Publishing Co. Ltd.,
55 York Street,
Sydney, N.S.W.
AUSTRALIA.

H. R. Elphick,
Empire Building,
Willis Street,
WELLINGTON, N.Z.

